483

J. G. Pollard
10 Grange Road
Ealing. W

943673

NCM
Ref
BS
1965
1897
V. 3

THE EXPOSITOR'S GREEK TESTAMENT

EDITED BY THE REV.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.

EDITOR OF "THE EXPOSITOR," "THE EXPOSITOR'S BIBLE," ETC

VOLUME III.

LONDON

HODDER AND STOUGHTON

27 PATERNOSTER ROW

1903

EX LIBRIS

JOHN WALTERS

THE ABERDEEN UNIVERSITY PRESS LIMITED

THE EXPOSITOR'S GREEK TESTAMENT

I

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS

BY THE VERY REV.

J. H. BERNARD, D.D.

DEAN OF ST. PATRICK'S, DUBLIN

II

THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS

BY THE REV.

FREDERIC RENDALL, M.A.

III

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS

BY THE REV.

S. D. F. SALMOND, D.D.

PRINCIPAL OF THE UNITED FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, ABERDEEN

IV

THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS

BY THE REV.

H. A. A. KENNEDY, D.Sc.

V

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS

BY PROFESSOR

A. S. PEAKE, M.A.

LONDON
HODDER AND STOUGHTON
27 PATERNOSTER ROW
1903

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO THE

CORINTHIANS

INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I.

THE TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

1. In the case of no book of the New Testament is it more essential to a true understanding of its language, that we should have a clear view of the circumstances under which it was composed, than in the case of 2 Corinthians. It is the most autobiographical of all St. Paul's letters, and it abounds in personal allusions, which it is difficult, at this distance of time, to appreciate, and of which some will probably always remain obscure. It glows with the heat of fervid life,[1] and was evidently written under the influence of strong emotion. And, if we do not assign it to its true place in St. Paul's life, we are likely to miss a good deal of the force of its earnest and eager words. It is, therefore, desirable to enter into more detail as to the occasion of its composition than was necessary in the case of a treatise like the Epistle to the Romans, the arguments of which are largely independent of the circumstances of the author at the time when it was written.

2. In the nineteenth chapter of the *Acts* we find that Ephesus has become St. Paul's headquarters; the centre of interest has been shifted from Jerusalem and Antioch, and the Apostle's labours are being mainly spent upon Asia Minor. Corinth, however, occupies a considerable share in his thoughts; and, during the period of over two years which he spends at Ephesus, communications with the Corinthian Church are being carried on. It is the sequence of events during this period and the subsequent six months that we have to examine. Such an examination of the *order* in which events followed one another might be made without any determination of the absolute dates of any; but it is convenient to

[1] See Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 98.

indicate here the system of chronology which has been adopted. Provisionally, the dates assigned to the principal events of St. Paul's life by Mr. Turner[1] will be taken as a basis for investigation. It is now pretty generally agreed among scholars that the dates formerly accepted, *e.g.*, by Wieseler and Lightfoot, are two years too late; but this does not, of course, affect materially the accuracy of Lightfoot's conclusions as to the order in which the several incidents of the Apostle's career took place. Indeed, the scheme of reconstruction of St. Paul's history while at Ephesus, which has approved itself to the present editor, is in the main that put forward by Lightfoot,[2] although his *dates* have not been followed. This scheme is not without difficulties; but it is dependent on fewer subsidiary hypotheses than any other which has been proposed, and it possesses special claim to consideration from the fact that it is an attempt to explain the documents as they stand without resort to the heroic measures of dissection which some critics have found it necessary to adopt.

3. I start, then, with the assumption that St. Paul's sojourn of over two years at Ephesus[3] (Acts xix. 10) lasted from December, 52, or January, 53, to March or April, 55, and I proceed to examine his communications with Corinth during that period. The Church at Corinth had been founded by the Apostle on his second missionary journey, late in the year 50 (Acts xviii. 1 f.);[4] but, all too soon after its foundation, it became apparent that the laxity of morals, for which Corinth was notorious, was showing itself in the lives of the Christian converts. Men do not easily shake themselves free from evil traditions and associations; and the power of the new faith took time to establish itself there as elsewhere. When the restraints imposed by the Apostle's presence were removed, various scandals betrayed the moral weakness of these clever Greeks who had welcomed the new teaching but a short time before. It would appear that while St. Paul was at Ephesus bad news reached him from Corinth as to the morals of his converts; and in consequence of this he paid to that city a brief disciplinary visit, of which indeed no account has been given by St. Luke, but which is alluded to in St. Paul's Epistles (see especially 2 Cor. xii. 21, where we are informed

[1] See article "Chronology of N.T." in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*.

[2] See *Biblical Essays*, pp. 222, 274.

[3] It is probable that the "three months" of ver. 8 is to be reckoned in addition to the "two years" of ver. 10; *cf.* τριετίαν, Acts xx. 31.

[4] On the Church at Corinth, see the first chapter of Prof. Findlay's *Introduction o 1 Corinthians* (vol. ii., p. 729 ff.).

that it was in consequence of the lax morality of the Corinthians that he visited them in grief).

4. The reasons for holding that this visit (which we shall call the "Intermediate Visit") took place are as follows. We have seen that St. Paul's first visit to Corinth is recorded in Acts xviii. Another visit is mentioned in Acts xx. 3, *viz.*, that which was subsequent to the two Canonical Epistles to the Corinthians, and which was in contemplation while he was writing both. Its date was 55-56. But it appears from 2 Cor. xii. 14, xiii. 1, that this was his *third* visit;[1] and hence a visit to Corinth must have been paid between the years 50 and 55 (probably towards the end of the period, say in the autumn of 54), of which no account is given in the *Acts*.[2] It is all but impossible to fit in this visit if we do not suppose it to have been paid from Ephesus; and it would have been an easy matter for St. Paul to have undertaken this. Ephesus was only a week or ten days' sail from Corinth, and on the receipt of ill news it would have been the most natural thing in the world that he should thus cross the Ægean hastily to set matters right. It appears distinctly from 2 Cor. ii. 1 that this visit was a painful one, and such as he would not wish again to have experience of. And, further, the language of xii. 21, xiii. 2, suggests that the trouble which caused this Painful Visit was not faction or schism, but unchastity of life among his converts.

5. St. Paul thereafter returned to Ephesus and wrote, probably after no long interval, a letter which is now lost. It is mentioned in 1 Cor. v. 9; and it contained, he tells us, injunctions to the Corinthian Christians "to keep no company with fornicators," injunctions (probably) suggested to him by what he had seen on his recent visit. That visit had been one of stern rebuke rather than of counsel; and it is quite intelligible that on his return he should desire to put in writing his deliberate advice. There is no indication that anything had happened up to this point which suggested the rise of schisms or of party spirit at Corinth. Indeed it may well have been that his visit, ἐν λύπῃ (2 Cor. ii. 1), was the proximate cause of the schisms with which the Church at Corinth was soon to be troubled; for the attempt to enforce discipline for lapses in morality

[1] This, indeed, has been denied by Paley (*Horæ Paulinæ*, chap. iv., § xi.) and, recently, by Prof. Ramsay (*St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 275) and Dr. Robertson (Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, vol. i., p. 494); but I cannot think that their explanations of 2 Cor. xii. 14, xiii. 1, as alluding to a visit intended, but not paid, are satisfactory.

[2] The language of 1 Cor. xvi. 7, οὐ θέλω γὰρ ὑμᾶς ἄρτι ἐν παρόδῳ ἰδεῖν, seems to suggest that his last visit to Corinth had been a brief and hasty one.

would naturally stir up party opposition, and would stimulate dis affection on the part of the less stable members of the little community. The Lost Letter, then, consisted mainly of rules as to conduct, and was not concerned, so far as we know, with the question of schism, which had probably not yet arisen.[1] Two other topics, however, it may have touched upon, *viz.*, the Apostle's plans of travel and the collection for the poor Judæan Christians. We must not lose sight of the fact that St. Paul's plans were in the main determined during these years by his purpose of making a collection to relieve the needs of the poorer converts in Judæa and of bringing it in person to Jerusalem. Now, as to his plans of travel, it is plain that the route mentioned in 1 Cor. xvi. 5, and actually adopted in the sequel (Acts xix. 21), was not the route which the Corinthians expected him to take. At one time he had wished to travel from Ephesus to Corinth—Macedonia—Corinth—Jerusalem, a route which would twice give them the benefit and the privilege of seeing him while he was in Europe (2 Cor. i. 15, 16). This plan seems to have been communicated to them before 1 Corinthians was written; and it is obvious to suggest that it was announced in the Lost Letter. Again, it will appear (see § 7) from a consideration of the structure of the First Canonical Epistle to the Corinthians that the Corinthians in *their* letter which preceded it had asked for details about the manner in which the collection for the Judæan Christians was to be made. In other words, they had already been informed by St. Paul that such a collection was being organised; and so we are led round to the suggestion that this information also was contained in the Lost Letter.

6. We now proceed with the history. Some time after the Lost Letter had been despatched bad news again came from Corinth, and this of two kinds. First, members of Chloe's household (οἱ Χλόης, 1 Cor. i. 11, *cf.* also 1 Cor. xi. 18) reported that factions had arisen, and that a Peter party and an Apollos party were setting themselves up in opposition to the party of Paul. Some indeed went so far as to call themselves, *par excellence*, the "Christ party" (1 Cor. i. 12). And, secondly, a rumour reached Ephesus that an abominable case of incest had occurred among the Christians at Corinth (1 Cor. v. 1). This was much worse than any of the moral lapses which the Apostle had previously rebuked in person or by letter; it was a wickedness

[1] This is an argument which should not be overlooked for placing the Intermediate Visit before the Lost Letter, or at any rate before the First Canonical Epistle.

which even the heathen did not tolerate.[1] About the same time that these distressing reports reached Ephesus, a dutiful message to St. Paul was brought from Corinth by Stephanas, Fortunatus and Achaicus (1 Cor. xvi. 17). These envoys seem to have brought with them a letter asking for advice on certain points of conduct and discipline, *viz.*, about Marriage, Celibacy, the use of Idol-meats, the Gifts of the Spirit, and the Collection,[2] with each of which the Apostle deals separately in his reply under a distinct heading, beginnning περὶ δέ . . . It is interesting, because so natural,[3] that the Corinthians seem to have made no mention in their letter of the schisms and disorders which had arisen among them.[4]

7. It was in consequence of the reports which had reached him, as well as in reply to this letter of the Corinthian Church, that St. Paul wrote the First Canonical Epistle. Of this the early part is entirely taken up with warnings against schism (chaps. i.-iv.), and with a stern rebuke for the sins of the flesh into which they had fallen, and of which the Church had not taken cognisance (chaps. v., vi.). The remainder of the Epistle is mainly occupied with the letter of the Corinthians to him, taking up their points in order: περὶ δὲ ὧν ἐγράψατε, καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ γυναικὸς μὴ ἅπτεσθαι (1 Cor. vii. 1); περὶ δὲ τῶν παρθένων (1 Cor. vii. 25); περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων (1 Cor. viii. 1); περὶ δὲ τῶν πνευματικῶν (1 Cor. xii. 1); περὶ δὲ τῆς λογίας (1 Cor. xvi. 1). It thus appears, and it is important to bear it in mind, that chaps. vii.-xvi. of 1 *Corinthians* are of the nature of an appendix or excursus, and that chaps. i.-vi. constitute the letter proper, as containing the Apostle's special message to the Corinthian Church at this juncture. His language in reference to the party spirit which was manifesting itself is grave and uncompromising (1 Cor. iii. 12-15), and he writes about his own position in a spirit of depression (1 Cor.

[1] See Cicero, *pro Cluentio*, 6, 15.

[2] Lewin (*St. Paul*, vol. i., p. 386) and Findlay (*Expositor*, June, 1900) have tried to reconstruct this letter; but beyond the general fact that it dealt with certain topics we have no data upon which to go.

[3] See Paley, *Horæ Paulinæ*, chap. iii., § i.

[4] Mention may be made here of an apocryphal letter of the Corinthians to St. Paul and his supposed reply, which are extant in Armenian and in Latin. An English translation by Lord Byron will be found in Stanley's *Corinthians*, vol. ii., p. 305. These letters do not correspond in any way to the lost correspondence discussed above (1 Cor. v. 9, xvi. 17), and, although they were admitted into the Armenian and Syrian canon, have no claim to authenticity or genuineness. They were originally incorporated in the apocryphal *Acts of Paul* (see Sanday, *Encycl. Biblica*, vol. i., p. 907).

iv. 11-13); but when he begins to speak of the bad living of his converts, and to comment on the shocking news which had reached him, his tone is one of severe and unsparing rebuke. He is astounded that such a scandal as has been mentioned to him (1 Cor. v. 1) should be endured for a moment, and he bids them excommunicate the offender at once (1 Cor. v. 5). In the Lost Letter he had warned them against associating with persons who lived impure lives, but now it has actually become necessary to rebuke them for tolerating the company of a man who is living unchastely with his stepmother (1 Cor. v. 1). They must "put away the wicked person" from among themselves (1 Cor. v. 13). It is their duty to "judge them that are within," and it is a scandalous thing that such wrongs as a Christian father endures when his son has robbed him of his wife should be brought for adjudication before heathen tribunals.[1] The Christian community should exercise its own spiritual prerogative (1 Cor. v. 4), and decide such cases without the interference of heathen lawyers (1 Cor. vi. 1-7). The wickedness of sins of the flesh only appears in its true light when judged on Christian principles (1 Cor. vi. 15 ff.), and it is by these that the fitting punishment should be determined.

8. Such is the language and the drift of the body of 1 *Corinthians*. The allusions to the Passover feast (1 Cor. v. 7, 8, *cf.* xv. 20, 23) make it probable that it was written about Easter, and the year was, according to the system we have adopted, 55 A.D. This is a consequence of 1 Cor. xvi. 8, from which it appears that when it was composed it was St. Paul's intention to leave Ephesus after the ensuing Pentecost. Thus the letter was written during the last months of his stay at that city.[2] Nothing is said as to the bearers of the letter; but 2 Cor. xii. 18 seems to indicate that Titus

[1] The Roman law under which a prosecution for adultery would be made was the *lex Julia de adulteriis*, passed by Augustus, 17 B.C. It is probable, however, that native Greek law would be enforced at Corinth. This also recognised adultery as an indictable offence; the damages allowed in any special case being assessed at the discretion of the judges.

[2] The subscription in the received text states that it was written at Philippi; but this is a manifest mistake, probably due to a misunderstanding of the words Μακεδονίαν γὰρ διέρχομαι in 1 Cor. xvi. 5. Ver. 8 of the same chapter is conclusive as to the place of writing. This subscription further adds that the letter was carried to Corinth by the envoys Stephanas, Fortunatus and Achaicus along with Timothy; but this again seems to be a misapprehension, although there is some justification in 1 Cor. xvi. 18 for the supposition that the envoys who had brought the Corinthian letter to Ephesus took back the answer (see above). For Timothy's movements see § 13 note.

and an unnamed brother (see note *in loc.*) were entrusted with it. This is confirmed by 2 Cor. ii. 13, vii. 6, passages which explain how St. Paul's grave anxiety as to the reception which the Corinthians would give to his letter of warning and rebuke was allayed by the news which Titus brought him about it (see notes *in loc.*).[1]

9. I have already remarked that the directions about the collection to be made at Corinth (1 Cor. xvi. 1) were given in answer to enquiries on the subject sent by the Corinthian Christians, and presuppose that his correspondents were already sensible of the obligation which rested upon them of helping the poor brethren of Judæa. It is only the *manner* in which the collection is to be made that is now prescribed for the first time (Easter, 55). And we have also seen (§ 5) that the information as to St. Paul's plans of travel given in 1 Cor. xvi. 5 was such as to cause the Corinthians keen disappointment.[2] He then announces that he will come *viâ* Macedonia, and that he may possibly winter at Corinth (1 Cor. xvi. 6). This plan was carried into effect. He left Ephesus about April, 55, shortly after the riot which was stirred up by Demetrius, and proceeded to Macedonia (Acts xx. 1) *viâ* Troas (2 Cor. ii. 12). Here he had arranged to meet Titus on the return of the latter from his mission to Corinth; but he was disappointed. We do not know how long he waited for Titus; but after an interval during which "a door was opened unto him" (2 Cor. ii. 12) he crossed over to Macedonia in much anxiety of spirit. At last they met at some undefined point in St. Paul's Macedonian tour of inspection (Acts xx. 2), not improbably at Philippi, as Neapolis the port of Philippi was the natural place of embarkation for Troas. Thus St. Paul would be likely to meet Titus at Philippi on his way to their rendezvous. Further, Philippi was a place where St. Paul

[1] See, on this question, Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, p. 280 f. Titus is mentioned nine times in 2 *Corinthians*, and evidently had a special interest in and connexion with Corinth. That his name does not appear in 1 *Corinthians* is no more surprising than that it does not appear in *Acts*. It is likely that it was the ability with which he conducted himself as the bearer of 1 *Corinthians*, and as St. Paul's representative at that critical moment at Corinth, that first marked him out as fit to be a leader in the Church.

[2] Dr. Robertson says (Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, vol. i., p. 493) that 1 Cor. xvi. 5, 6 is "a passage totally out of correspondence with the situation presupposed in 2 Cor. i. 23. Moreover, in defending his change of plan (2 Cor. i. 15-23) St. Paul would not have failed to appeal to the clear statement of his intentions in 1 Cor. xvi. 5." I cannot understand where the difficulty comes in. The Corinthians took umbrage at the message of 1 Cor. xvi. 5; appealing to it would have had no point. St. Paul's line of defence is quite sound (see § 12 below).

had many good and staunch friends; and it was a suitable centre from which to visit the Christian communities formerly founded by him.[1]

10. Titus reported in the first instance that the Corinthians had loyally responded to the appeal made by St. Paul in 1 Cor. v. and vi. as to their treatment of the case of incest. They had taken the case into their own hands, and had punished the offender with extreme severity (2 Cor. ii. 6 ff.). They had gone so far in their zeal to assert the spiritual prerogative of the Church, in which St. Paul deemed himself to have an important share (2 Cor. vii. 12; *cf.* 1 Cor. v. 4, **συναχθέντων ὑμῶν καὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ πνεύματος**), that it was now desirable to offer counsels of forbearance (2 Cor. ii. 6 f.) rather than to inflame their indignation against the offender. The really important end which the Apostle had in view when writing 1 Cor. v. had been gained, *viz.*, he had convinced the members of the Church that it was *their* duty to take cognisance of grave moral offences. Quite possibly the civil courts might have decided equitably as to the measure of the penalty to be inflicted for the **ἀδικία**; but the primary purpose of his sharp rebuke was not to secure due retribution in this particular instance (**οὐχ εἵνεκεν τοῦ ἀδικήσαντος οὐδὲ εἵνεκεν τοῦ ἀδικηθέντος**, 2 Cor. vii. 12), although this was doubtless necessary, but to awaken the sleeping conscience of the Church to pass judgment in all cases of moral lapse, as was its inherent right and privilege. The Church at Corinth was an Apostolic Church. It had been founded by St. Paul. Though "absent in body" he was "present in spirit" at the deliberations of its members (1 Cor. v. 3). And to vindicate the spiritual authority of the Church founded by him was, in effect, to vindicate *his* authority. Thus he can go so far as to say that the main purpose of his stern letter of rebuke (1 Cor.) was **ἕνεκεν τοῦ φανερωθῆναι τὴν σπουδὴν ὑμῶν τὴν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ** (2 Cor. vii. 12, where see note). To manifest their zeal for St. Paul's authority was to manifest their sense that Christian standards of living were widely different from heathen standards, and it was further to recognise that the Church has spiritual authority "to bind and to loose". In exhibiting their zeal for him, their founder, they had made clear their recognition of this great principle. If it be said that to read this into 2 Cor. vii. 12 is to go beyond the tenor of the words used, it must be replied

[1] The subscription to 2 Corinthians, **Πρὸς Κορινθίους δευτέρα ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Φιλίππων τῆς Μακεδονίας διὰ Τίτου καὶ Λουκᾶ**, would be a confirmation of this conclusion, if any reliance could be placed on these colophons to the Epistles. See notes on 2 Cor. viii. 18, xiii. 14.

that St. Paul's language in the earlier letter sufficiently shows the high spiritual authority which he would have the Corinthians attach to the deliberate decisions of their assembled leaders. "In the name of our Lord Jesus, ye being gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of the Lord Jesus" (1 Cor. v. 4). The words "and my spirit" indicate not only his sympathy for them, but his assurance that the decisions to which such an assembly would be guided would be even as the decisions promulgated by his own apostolic authority which was "not from men, neither through man, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father".[1]

11. The second matter which Titus reported was not so satisfactory to St. Paul. Titus explained, as it would seem, that the Corinthians were much distressed at the news that the Apostle's plans of travel had been changed (2 Cor. i. 16, 17), and that they were ready in consequence to impute to him instability of purpose which amounted to fickleness. St. Paul's answer is found in 2 Cor. i. 23, ii. 4. He did not carry out his former intention of crossing direct from Ephesus to Corinth because he thought it better that there should be a short interval, during which they might mend their ways, before he again addressed them. His last visit (the "Intermediate Visit") had been ἐν λύπῃ; and it was undesirable that his next visit should be of the same character. So instead of visiting them at once, he wrote a severe letter (1 Cor.), and proceeded to Macedonia in the first instance, reserving his visit to Corinth until they should have had time to profit by his written rebukes. In this change of plan there was no display of fickleness; his one desire was to edify them and to do what was best for their true welfare.

12. And, thirdly, Titus had no good news to bring about the factions in Corinth, concerning which St. Paul had already written (1 Cor. i. 12-18, iii. 1-6). When he despatched the First Canonical Epistle he was already aware that his authority had been called in question at Corinth, and that some were passing unfavourable judgments upon his acts (1 Cor. iv. 3-5). Already he had bidden the rebellious party not to be too ready to judge by the superficial appearance of things, but to distrust their hasty conclusions about him (1 Cor. iv. 5, 10-14). He had written mildly, but with authority, as became an Apostle. "Be ye imitators of me" he had twice repeated (1 Cor. iv. 16, xi. 1). And he had assured them that when he came, as he certainly would come (1 Cor. xi. 34), to Corinth, those who had ventured to rebel would be treated with severity, if they did not

[1] Gal. i. 1.

repent (1 Cor. iv. 18-21). But Titus seems to have reported that the factious opposition to St. Paul's authority was even more bitter than it was before 1 Corinthians was written. The Apostle's postponement of his visit gave the malcontents courage to break out into open defiance (2 Cor. x. 10-12).

13. On learning all these facts from Titus, in part consoling, in part most distressing, St. Paul wrote the Second Canonical Epistle to the Corinthians, associating the name of Timothy with his own in the address at the beginning.[1] The principal person entrusted with the carriage of the letter was, as was natural, Titus (2 Cor. viii. 17), whose former mission had been so prudently and honourably discharged (2 Cor. xii. 17, 18). With Titus were associated two

[1] It will be convenient to state at this point the view of Timothy's movements which has been adopted. We learn from 1 Cor. iv. 17, xvi. 10, that he was supposed by St. Paul to be on his way to Corinth when the First Canonical Epistle was written, and that the Apostle expected him to return to Ephesus with "the brethren" who were the bearers of that letter (1 Cor. xvi. 11). It does not appear that he was entrusted with any special mission to the Corinthian Church, the language of 1 Cor. iv. 17, "who shall put you in remembrance of my ways which be in Christ," being suggestive rather of informal conference than of a formal embassy, and that of 1 Cor. xvi. 10, 11 implying, as it would seem, that Timothy is to be welcomed at Corinth only as a passing visitor on his way back to the Apostle's side. Now it is natural to identify this journey made by Timothy with that recorded in Acts xix. 22, where St. Paul is said during the last weeks of his stay in Ephesus to have "sent into Macedonia two of them that ministered unto him, Timothy and Erastus". Timothy had been associated with St. Paul on his first visit (about the year 50) to the cities of Macedonia (Acts xvii. 14, 15, xviii. 5), and he was evidently a suitable lieutenant to send in advance to prepare the way for the Apostle's second visit. Most probably the business of the collection in Macedonia was entrusted to him to organise. And the date of this journey of Timothy to Macedonia (January or February, 55) well agrees with the date which must be assigned to the journey referred to in 1 Cor. iv. 17, xvi. 10. The plan seems to have been to visit the churches of Macedonia (this, the important purpose of the journey, is all that is mentioned in Acts) and then to return to Ephesus by sea from Corinth (this, as the only point in the journey interesting to the Corinthians, is alone mentioned in 1 Cor.). Erastus, Timothy's fellow-traveller on this occasion, bore the same name as the city treasurer at Corinth, whom we find there about February, 56 (Rom. xvi. 23), as well as at a later period (2 Tim. iv. 20); and it is highly reasonable to identify him with this important member of the Corinthian Church, and to suppose that when we find him with Timothy he was on his way home. Timothy is also found at Corinth in St. Paul's company when the Epistle to the Romans was written (Rom. xvi. 21); but we have nothing to show us whether or no he had got so far during the preceding spring. It is on the whole probable that he found so much to do in Macedonia that he stayed there during the whole spring and summer of 55 (so Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, p. 276 f.). At any rate we meet with him next in Macedonia (and probably, as we have seen, at Philippi) in St. Paul's company about the month of November, 55, when 2 Corinthians was despatched (2 Cor. i. 1).

others, possibly Luke and Barnabas, but of their names we cannot be certain (2 Cor. viii. 18, 22, where see notes). The Epistle being despatched, St. Paul travelled slowly through Macedonia, arriving at Corinth in due course as he had promised (1 Cor. xvi. 5, 6), and staying there three months (Acts xx. 3). This period probably covered December, 55, and January and February, 56. In consequence of a Jewish plot he then returned through Macedonia instead of sailing direct for Syria as he had intended to do (Acts xx. 3); and starting from Philippi "after the days of unleavened bread" (Acts xx. 6), *i.e.*, March 18-25, he arrived in Jerusalem in time for the Pentecost festival of the year 56.

14. The account which has been given above of the sequence of events during St. Paul's sojourn at Ephesus assumes that the First Canonical Epistle to the Corinthians is the "Painful Letter" to which the Apostle alludes in 2 Cor. ii. 4, vii. 8, 12; and it has been urged by several critics that it does not answer to the description there given.[1] The two allusions are as follows: "For out of much affliction and anguish of heart I wrote unto you with many tears; not that ye should be made sorry, but that ye might know the love which I have more abundantly unto you" (2 Cor. ii. 4); and "For though I made you sorry with my epistle, I do not regret it although I did regret; for I see that that epistle made you sorry, though but for a season. . . . So although I wrote unto you, I wrote not for his cause that did the wrong nor for his cause that suffered the wrong, but that your zeal on our behalf might be made manifest unto you in the sight of God" (2 Cor. vii. 8, 12). It is said that "from beginning to end of 1 Corinthians there are no traces of anguish of heart and much affliction, either in utterances expressing these feelings or in the style of the Epistle itself".[2] I believe that the passages which have been quoted in § 8 demonstrate the inaccuracy of any such assertion. Critics have strangely overlooked in this connexion the fact that chaps. vii.-xvi. of 1 Corinthians are mainly taken up with answering the queries which his correspondents had put to St. Paul; and that the body of the letter proper is contained in chaps. i.-vi. It is in these earlier chapters that we are to look for traces of mental anguish and depression, and I hold that they are plainly there to be found, and that the note of identification afforded by 2 Cor. ii. 4 is answered by such passages

[1] *E.g.*, this objection was raised by Klöpper (1870) and has been repeated by Waite in the *Speaker's Commentary*, by Robertson (Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, vol. i., p. 494) and by Kennedy (*2 and 3 Corinthians*, p. 64 f.), as well as by others.

[2] Kennedy, *loc. cit.*, p. 65.

as 1 Cor. iii. 12-15, iv. 11-13, v. 1-6, 13, vi. 5, 9-11. Had the structure of 1 Corinthians been sufficiently attended to, I cannot think that this objection would ever have seemed forcible. And so with 2 Cor. vii. 8. It has been urged against the identification of the "Painful Letter" with 1 Corinthians that "it is scarcely comprehensible that St. Paul should have said, even in a moment of strong excitement, of so costly a monument of Christian truth as the First Epistle is, that he repented for a while of ever having written it".[1] But this is to exaggerate the measure of the Apostle's regret. He merely says (2 Cor. vii. 8) that for a moment he regretted having given them pain by what he had written, *i.e.*, he regretted the severe sentences which he had penned; but not that he lamented the composition of the whole Epistle. The earlier part of the Epistle, which is, I repeat, the core of the letter, is extremely severe, and especially chaps. v. and vi.[2] In the phrase "the Painful Letter" there is, in fact, a latent fallacy. The language of 2 Cor. ii. 4, vii. 8, would be sufficiently accounted for if *any* part of the letter to which he refers seemed to St. Paul (for the moment) to be unduly severe, or if *any* section of it had caused unexpected grief to the Corinthians.

15. An objection of a somewhat similar character is that the language used in 2 Cor. ii. 6-11 cannot be taken as referring to the punishment of the offender of 1 Cor. v. 1-5, inasmuch as the mild treatment suggested by St. Paul in the later Epistle would be quite inadequate to the offence.[3] Not to dwell on the fact that unrelenting severity is not a Christian virtue, and that Titus may have reported some extenuating circumstances of which we know nothing, I believe that the considerations brought forward above in § 10 go a long way to break the force of this objection. The intimate connexion between the fifth and sixth chapters of 1 Corinthians has not been sufficiently recognised by commentators, and thus the primary purpose of St. Paul's message of rebuke has been misconceived. He was more anxious to awaken the sleeping conscience of the Church at Corinth, and to prevail upon its members to exercise their powers of spiritual discipline, than to adjudicate between the wronged father and the offending son. Excommunication was the only suitable penalty for the latter's grave offence, but St. Paul had never meant

[1] Waite, *Speaker's Commentary*, p. 383.

[2] Compare also the great severity of the incidental remark in 1 Cor. xv. 2, ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ εἰκῆ ἐπιστεύσατε. That he should suggest such a possibility shows how much he is depressed as he writes.

[3] This is urged by Schmiedel and Jülicher amongst others.

to convey (although the Corinthians had misunderstood his counsel) that the ban could not be taken off by the same authority which had imposed it, if evidence of penitence were forthcoming. Indeed the identification of ὁ ἀδικήσας in 2 Cor. vii. 12 with the offender of 1 Cor. v. 1 seems to be not doubtful when the language and purport of the earlier passage are considered. I have already pointed out (§ 10) that the aim of the Apostle in writing 1 Cor. v. and vi. was not merely that the offender should be excommunicated, but that the scandal of such a case being brought by Christians before a heathen court should be avoided. Consider, further, St. Paul's language. Some persons, he says (1 Cor. iv. 18, 19), "were puffed up" (ἐφυσιώθησαν) as though he were not coming; *i.e.*, they made little of his authority in his absence. The same word (πεφυσιωμένοι) is used (1 Cor. v. 2) of the action, or rather the inaction, of the Christian community in reference to the case of incest; and in this matter he declares "Your boasting is not good" (οὐ καλὸν τὸ καύχημα ὑμῶν, 1 Cor. v. 6). That is to say, their καύχημα consisted in their resistance to his apostolic authority; they were "puffed up," and so they had not dealt with the offender as they would have done had they followed his teachings (1 Cor. v. 2). It is with reference to this that he says in the later letter, εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ ἔγραψα, ἵνα γνῶ τὴν δοκιμὴν ὑμῶν, εἰ εἰς πάντα ὑπήκοοί ἐστε (2 Cor. ii. 9). Again, the sentence which he directs to be pronounced upon the offender is παραδοῦναι τὸν τοιοῦτον τῷ Σατανᾷ εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός (1 Cor. v. 5); but when he bids them be merciful and forgive, his reason is ἵνα μὴ πλεονεκτηθῶμεν ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ (2 Cor. ii. 11). The man was only "delivered over to Satan," εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός (1 Cor. v. 5); but care must be taken lest Satan rob the Church of his soul (2 Cor. ii. 11). The reference to Satan in the later Epistle is pointless, unless we bear in mind the tenor of the sentence in the earlier one. And there is another phrase perhaps worthy of attention. The offender is called ὁ ἀδικήσας in 2 Cor. vii. 12, and the injured person is ὁ ἀδικηθείς. If we turn back to 1 Cor. vi. we find that the words ἀδικεῖν and ἄδικος (1 Cor. vi. 8, 9) are specially used of the carnal offences which St. Paul has there in view. The point of his rebuke in that chapter is that it would have been better for the offended father to have suffered wrong (ἀποστερεῖσθε; *cf.* for the force of this 1 Cor. vii. 5) than to have brought the matter before the heathen tribunals. And when St. Paul speaks of the Corinthians as having proved themselves in the end to be ἁγνοὺς τῷ πράγματι (2 Cor. vii. 11), the last words recall the ἐν τῷ πράγματι of 1 Thess. iv. 6, where the reference is to adultery, the language used being strikingly like that of

1 Cor. vi. 8. There are also some other links connecting the "Painful Letter" with 1 Corinthians which should not be overlooked. In 2 Cor. ii. 4 St. Paul is careful to explain that the letter which was written with tears was written οὐχ ἵνα λυπηθῆτε, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀγάπην ἵνα γνῶτε ἣν ἔχω περισσοτέρως εἰς ὑμᾶς. It might be expected therefore that the Painful Letter should exhibit some trace of this overflowing ἀγάπη. And such a trace is conspicuously present in the last words of 1 Corinthians, ἡ ἀγάπη μου μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (1 Cor. xvi. 24). No other letter of St. Paul's has so affectionate a farewell. It was plainly added for some special reason. But if we identify this letter with the "Painful Letter," 2 Cor. ii. 4 gives an excellent reason for its addition. And, once more, the reference in 2 Cor. iii. 1 f. to a former self-commendation which the Apostle had indited finds its best and simplest explanation if we bring it into connexion with 1 Cor. ix. 1 f.

16. Something must now be said about other schemes of reconstruction of the history which have been proposed by recent writers. It is unnecessary to rehearse them all,[1] but the discussion of one or two of the most plausible may serve to bring the difficulties of the problem into clearer relief, and to supply tests by which the adequacy of the solution that has been adopted may be estimated. In England, the editor of 1 *Corinthians* in this Commentary, Professor Findlay,[2] and Professor Sanday[3] (not to speak of German writers) interpolate a *second* lost letter from St. Paul to the Corinthians between the First and Second Canonical Epistles. They hold it probable that the embassy of Timothy to Corinth *viâ* Macedonia (Acts xix. 22, 1 Cor. iv. 17, xvi. 10) succeeded so far as this, that Timothy reached Corinth, but that his mission was not a success as regards the healing of disorders there. In consequence of the bad report brought back by Timothy, St. Paul wrote a *second* lost letter and sent it by the more capable hands of Titus.[4] It is the return of Titus from this mission which St. Paul awaited with such anxiety at Troas (2 Cor. i. 13), and the missive which Titus bore was the Painful Letter to which the Apostle alludes in 2 Cor. ii. 4, vii. 8.

[1] An elaborate account of the various theories which have been propounded will be found in an article by Hilgenfeld in his *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* (1899), and a comparative table is given by Schmiedel in the *Hand Kommentar*, pp. viii, ix. *Cf.* also Jülicher's *Einleitung* for a good discussion.

[2] See vol. ii., p. 736 f., and Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, vol. iii., p. 711 ff., *s.v.* "Paul".

[3] *Encycl. Biblica*, vol. i., p. 901 f.

[4] On this hypothesis Titus was not the bearer of 1 *Corinthians*.

Another scheme agreeing with this, in so far as it refuses to identify the Painful Letter with 1 *Corinthians*, has recently been expounded by Dr. Robertson.[1] This writer holds that after the despatch of 1 Corinthians by the hands of Titus, St. Paul changed the plan of travel announced in that letter (1 Cor. xvi. 5) and decided to take the route Ephesus—Corinth—Macedonia—Corinth, which would give the Corinthians a δευτέρα χαρά; that painful news having been brought back by Titus from Corinth, the Apostle reverted to the plan announced in 1 Cor. xvi. 5, as he was unwilling to visit Corinth so soon under the circumstances; that he wrote a severe letter, now lost, of which Titus was again the bearer; and that it was on Titus' report of the result of this second mission that 2 Corinthians was written and entrusted to the same capable messenger.

17. On both these theories the same observation may be made at the outset. They are highly complicated. Quite apart in the one case from the assumption (for which there is no evidence) that Timothy reached Corinth and that his mission there was a failure, and from the assumption in the other case[2] that the language of 2 Cor. i. 15 cannot be explained unless we suppose St. Paul to have changed his mind as to his route *twice* after the despatch of 1 *Corinthians*, both theories presuppose events and documents of which no historical trace has survived. Doubtless we must not assume that all the facts have been recorded; it may be necessary to introduce some hypotheses in order to co-ordinate the fragments of history at our disposal. Nevertheless, the theory which depends on the fewest hypotheses has the best claim to acceptance, provided that it covers the facts. Now the writers whose theories have been indicated in § 16 agree in interpolating a letter between 1 Corinthians and 2 Corinthians, which has utterly vanished out of knowledge. Such an interpolated letter was suggested by Bleek as long ago as 1830, and its actuality has been assumed by many critics since in Germany as well as in England. No doubt the phenomena may be accounted for by an artifice of this sort. We may put anything we please into a letter of which we know nothing; there is no way of proving our speculations to be wrong. But the necessity for so large an hypothesis must be glaringly evident before the hypothesis can be justified.

[1] Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, vol. i., p. 495, *s.v.* "2 Corinthians".

[2] Dr. Sanday seems also to favour this idea of a double change of intention as to his route on the part of St. Paul (*Encycl. Biblica*, vol. i., p. 903). See § 16 above.

And it has not been proved, as we have seen (§§ 14, 15), that the "Painful Letter" of 2 Cor. ii. 4, vii. 8, cannot have been the First Canonical Epistle to the Corinthians. It is upon this supposed impossibility that the whole edifice of theory rests, and the base does not appear—to the present writer at least—to be broad enough to bear the superstructure.

CHAPTER II.

THE INTEGRITY OF THE EPISTLE.

1. Our discussion has hitherto taken for granted the *unity* of the Epistle (2 Cor.) with which we have to do. But this has been repeatedly questioned, and the arguments alleged in support of the composite character of the document require to be considered in detail. So far back as 1767 Semler urged that the Epistle could be resolved into three parts: (1) chaps. i.-viii. + Rom. xvi. 1-20 + chap. xiii. 11-13; (2) chaps. x.-xiii. 10; (3) chap. ix.; of which he held (2) to be posterior to (1). After a struggling existence the analysis attracted fresh interest when Hausrath in 1870 took it up in part and advocated the distinctness of chaps. x.-xiii. from chaps. i.-ix. Schmiedel (in the *Hand Kommentar*) defended this view in 1890, and Clemen has since adopted it, and indeed regards it as an established result of criticism.[1] The theory has not had many advocates in England, but it has been vigorously supported by Dr. J. H. Kennedy in his work entitled *The Second and Third Epistles to the Corinthians* (1900). By no writer has the matter been more carefully and acutely investigated, and his arguments demand attention.

2. Dr. Kennedy's view of the sequence of events during St. Paul's stay at Ephesus is as follows: 1. Titus was sent on a mission to Corinth to preach and to continue St. Paul's work (2 Cor. xii. 18) at some period after the Apostle's first visit (Acts xviii. 1). 2. Lost Letter to the Corinthians. 3. Mission of Timothy to Corinth (1 Cor. iv. 17, xvi. 5). 4. 1 *Corinthians* written from Ephesus about April, 54. 5. St. Paul stayed at Ephesus because of the greatness of the opportunity there (1 Cor. xvi. 8). 6. He formed a fixed purpose of visiting Jerusalem with the offerings which were being collected (Acts xix. 21). 7. Bad news came from Corinth. 8. St. Paul accordingly paid a brief disciplinary visit

[1] See *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 22nd Dec., 1900; and *cf.* Clemen's work entitled *Die Einheitlichkeit d. paulin. Briefe.*

to that city. 9. On his return he wrote from Ephesus the Painful Letter, of which the end is preserved to us in 2 Cor. x.-xiii. 10. Mission of Timothy to Macedonia (Acts xix. 22). 11. Mission of Titus to Corinth to subdue the rebels there. 12. On Titus' report of the success of his mission St. Paul wrote from Macedonia about November, 55, a letter of which we have the beginning preserved in 2 Cor. i.-ix., the rest being lost. 13. This letter was forwarded to Corinth by Titus and two unnamed companions, the bearers being entrusted also with the business of the collection (2 Cor. viii. 6). It will be recognised at once that this is a highly complicated scheme. Dr. Kennedy has to assume *three* missions of Titus to Corinth instead of two, the number which commentators have generally recognised; and he has, in like manner, to find room for *two* missions of Timothy, one to Corinth (1 Cor. iv. 17) and a second, quite distinct from this, to Macedonia (Acts xix. 21). In addition, he has to push back the date of 1 *Corinthians* by a year, in order to give time for all the incidents of which he finds traces in the Epistles; and he splits up 2 Corinthians into two fragmentary letters. We shall consider these points separately.

3. First, then, as to the missions of Titus. Dr. Kennedy takes in close connexion the two verses 2 Cor. viii. 6, 7, and translates (p. 122), "I summoned (? exhorted) Titus that as he had made a beginning, so he might accomplish in you this grace also; yea that as ye abound in everything, in faith and utterance, and in all diligence, and in your love towards us, so ye may abound in this grace also". This translation is probably right (see note *in loc.*); but the inference which its author derives from it is by no means inevitable. Dr. Kennedy holds that the words prove that the furtherance of the collection for Jerusalem was the purpose of Titus' later visit only, and formed no part of his commission in the earlier visit. But this cannot be maintained. Such an interpretation will harmonise with Dr. Kennedy's scheme of Titus' visits (see above); but the passage is quite consistent with the other view that Titus' two visits to Corinth were made as the bearer of the two Canonical Epistles. For in what St. Paul says, the emphasis is on the contrast between προενήρξατο and ἐπιτελέσῃ. A beginning had been made by Titus in the matter of the collection; he is now to finish his work, that the Corinthians may be as conspicuous for their liberality as they already are for other graces. Dr. Kennedy objects to this that it is inconceivable that St. Paul when sending Titus with a strong message of rebuke should also have instructed him to obtain money contributions. 'Such a course," he says, "would have been as inconsistent

with wise diplomacy as with the self-respect which formed so marked a feature in St. Paul's character."[1] But to argue thus is to overlook the fact that St. Paul's instructions about the collection in 1 Cor. xvi. 1-5 were given in answer to queries addressed to him on the subject by the Church of Corinth. The first part of the letter which Titus carried was taken up with rebuke; but there was nothing undiplomatic in the fact that St. Paul sent his answers to these queries by the same hand. In fact to have withheld his answer would have only given offence.[2]

4. We have now to consider the evidence adduced for the dissection of 2 Corinthians. First, it is urged that there is not only a change of tone at x. 1, but that the way in which the chapter opens shows that something has been lost which immediately preceded it. Αὐτὸς δὲ ἐγὼ are the first words, and δέ (it is said) marks an antithesis. The passage "contains an allusion to an objection which had been brought against the Apostle, which it brings before us not as if the subject were now for the first time introduced, but as if it had been already mentioned".[3] Rather should we say that δέ marks the transition to a new subject, a usage to which we have an exact parallel in viii. 1 of this very Epistle; where after the words which conclude chap. vii., χαίρω ὅτι ἐν παντὶ θαρρῶ ἐν ὑμῖν, St. Paul passes to his next topic with the words γνωρίζομεν δὲ ὑμῖν. Another parallel is found at 1 Cor. xv. 1, where in like manner a new subject is introduced by the words γνωρίζω δὲ ὑμῖν. It is unnecessary to assume, as some have done, that the change of tone here was caused by the arrival at this point of a messenger from Corinth bringing tidings later and less favourable than that brought by Titus. This may, indeed, be so; but the hypothesis is not needed. It is hardly likely that any of St. Paul's more important letters were written or dictated at a single sitting; and the change of tone is sufficiently accounted for by a change of mood such as every busy and over-burdened man is subject to, especially

[1] *Loc. cit.*, p. 124.

[2] These considerations also break the force of Dr. Kennedy's main argument for the early date of 1 *Corinthians*. It is plain that the business of the collection had been set on foot *before* the date of that letter, in which counsel is given as to the best method of carrying it on; and thus the phrase ἀπὸ πέρυσι (2 Cor. viii. 10, ix. 2), in which so much difficulty has been found, receives adequate explanation. The Corinthians would truly be said in November, 55, to have "made a beginning" a year ago, and St. Paul's boast to the Macedonian Christians that Achaia had been "prepared for a year past" was quite justifiable (see note *in loc.*).

[3] Kennedy, *loc. cit.*, p. 96.

if his health is not very robust (*cf.* 2 Cor. i. 8, 9, and xii. 7). The Second Epistle to the Corinthians is not a formal treatise like the Epistle to the Romans; it is a personal letter, and in such letters we have no reason to expect either systematic arrangement of topics or pedantically uniform treatment.

5. This consideration helps us, too, to dispose of the difficulty that the last four chapters contemplate an openly rebellious minority at Corinth, the existence of which is not emphasised in the first nine chapters. It was entirely natural that Titus' report being of a mixed character, partly good and partly bad, St. Paul's letter based upon it should show traces at once of his gratification and of his grief. And, indeed, chaps. i.-ix. are not without indications that his authority was not cheerfully accepted by *all* the Corinthian Christians. His defence against the charge of fickleness (i. 15-17) shows that the charge had been made; the mention of οἱ πλείονες in ii. 6 (*cf.* iv. 15) shows that a minority did not heartily concur in the sentence which was inflicted, although, as a matter of fact, all had acquiesced in his view that the Church should take cognisance of the moral scandal which had occurred;[1] he more than hints in ii. 17 that οἱ πολλοί make merchandise of the word of God, and his remark loses point if none such were to be found at Corinth; that τινες, "some persons," make use of commendatory letters (iii. 1) is brought up to their disparagement; the comparison between the ministries of the Old and New Covenants in iii. 6 f. is indirectly aimed at the Judaising party (xi. 22, 23); so, too, those who boast ἐν προσώπῳ καὶ οὐ καρδίᾳ (v. 12) are his Corinthian opponents; and, lastly, the force of the antitheses in vi. 8-10 depends on the fact that corresponding statements to his discredit were being made at Corinth. The situation was simply this. The Church as a whole (and, indeed, unanimously, *cf.* vii. 15, 16) had taken the action he desired in the case of the offender; but there remained a turbulent minority who resisted his authority in other matters. The evil of unchastity does not here need special consideration; it was *always* present at Corinth.

6. It is time to adduce the passages upon which defenders of the theory that chaps. x.-xiii. constitute a part of the Painful Letter mainly depend. The case is best put by Dr. Kennedy,[2] who produces

[1] I cannot think that Dr. Kennedy's view (*loc. cit.*, p. 102) that the "minority" here indicated were out-and-out supporters of St. Paul who were anxious to go arther even than he, will commend itself to many minds.

[2] *Loc. cit.*, p. 81 f.

three pairs of parallels between the first nine and the last four chapters of the Epistle. (*a*) In xiii. 10 the Apostle wrote διὰ τοῦτο ταῦτα ἀπὼν γράφω, ἵνα παρὼν μὴ ἀποτόμως χρήσωμαι; and to this it is said that ii. 3, καὶ ἔγραψα τοῦτο αὐτό, ἵνα μὴ ἐλθὼν λύπην ἔχω, refers. But this reference is by no means inevitable; it is quite as natural to suppose that the effect of the Painful Letter (which I take to be 1 *Corinthians*) having been so salutary, as is indicated in ii. 3, the Apostle would again try the effect of a written threat of severe dealing. (*b*) In xiii. 2 we have προείρηκα καὶ προλέγω ὡς παρὼν τὸ δεύτερον καὶ ἀπὼν νῦν τοῖς προημαρτηκόσιν καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς πᾶσιν, ὅτι ἐὰν ἔλθω εἰς τὸ πάλιν οὐ φείσομαι, to which i. 23 corresponds well if we suppose it written at a later date, *viz.*, φειδόμενος ὑμῶν οὐκέτι ἦλθον εἰς Κόρινθον. On the other hand, it is plain that the texts may be taken up by another handle; and we may understand their sequence to be that the Apostle having said at i. 23 that he had not come to Corinth before as he wished to spare them, he explains at xiii. 2 with plain sternness that when he does come he will *not* spare. There is nothing gained in lucidity or in force by the hypothesis that xiii. 2 represents the earlier statement and i. 23 the later. (*c*) Again, in x. 6, St. Paul says of himself: ἐν ἑτοίμῳ ἔχοντες ἐκδικῆσαι πᾶσαν παρακοήν, ὅταν πληρωθῇ ὑμῶν ἡ ὑπακοή, while at ii. 9 he writes, εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ ἔγραψα ἵνα γνῶ τὴν δοκιμὴν ὑμῶν, εἰ εἰς πάντα ὑπήκοοί ἐστε. Here it is not to be gainsaid that an excellent sense emerges from counting x. 6 to be prior to ii. 9, which seems, when taken in connexion with vii. 15, 16, to speak of unanimous obedience on the part of the Christians at Corinth. But the character of this obedience has been indicated above in § 4. So far as the specific case as to which St. Paul had written the Painful Letter was concerned, the "obedience" had been that of "all"; but there remained a faction which was disobedient at heart, and until they should have yielded to his authority it could not be said that their "obedience" was "fulfilled". As to these three pairs of parallel passages, then, it is not the case that a satisfactory explanation can be provided only by the expedient of recognising chaps. x.-xiii. as prior to chaps. i.-ix.; on the contrary, they yield a consistent sense when the Epistle is interpreted as a continuous whole. A remarkable commentary upon the danger of relying too much on coincidences of language of this sort is afforded by the fact that exactly an opposite inference to that with which we have been dealing has been drawn by another critic, Drescher. This writer, like Schmiedel and Clemen and Kennedy, regards chaps. x.-xiii. as distinct from chaps. i.-ix.; but he is led from internal evidence, as it appears to him, to count the Nine Chapters

as *earlier* in date than the Four.[1] When internal evidence leads competent scholars to such entirely divergent conclusions, it is a natural inference that the arguments on which they rely do not amount to demonstration.

7. It is further to be borne in mind that the theory which regards chaps. i.-ix. and chaps. x.-xiii. as parts of distinct letters which have been joined together by mistake depends on the concurrence of several improbable hypotheses. We have to suppose not only that chaps. i.-ix. are a fragment of a longer letter which has lost its concluding pages, and that chaps. x.-xiii. are a fragment of a longer letter which has lost its opening pages, but that in each case the mutilation happened to come at a point where a new sentence began a new page. This is a most unlikely thing to happen. Take any book or manuscript at random and count the number of places where the tearing away of pages does not leave a clause incomplete. The number will be small indeed.[2] But the measure of the improbability of this happening must be twice repeated before we reach the improbability of 2 Cor. i.-ix. and 2 Cor. x.-xiii. being *both* fragments. For neither 2 Cor. ix. 15 nor 2 Cor. x. 1 is an incomplete sentence. It has been argued indeed (see above, § 4) that 2 Cor. x. 1, **αὐτὸς δὲ ἐγὼ . . .** , points to some preceding argument which is not to be found in 2 Cor. ix. The argument is unconvincing; but what is here dealt with is the improbability that a tearing of the MS. should have left no trace on the grammatical coherence of the sentence which followed the mutilation. In fact, it is not too much to say that the phenomena of the existing document cannot be explained as resulting from the mere juxtaposition of two fragments of other letters. We have to postulate, in addition, an editor who trimmed the ragged edges and brought the end of chap. ix. and the beginning of chap. x. into grammatical sequence by emendation of the texts which the two fragments presented. And beside all this we have yet to reckon with the improbability, be it great or small, that the two fragments belonging to distinct letters should have become joined together under the mistaken impression that they were parts of one whole.

[1] *Studien und Kritiken*, Jan., 1897. Krenkel takes the same view, and holds that chaps. x.-xiii. form a letter later in date than chaps. i.-ix. This was also Semler's view.

[2] A good illustration is afforded by the end of St. Mark's Gospel. It is generally (though not universally) believed that a page has been lost at the end, and that the present conclusion is by another hand. But one of the strongest arguments for this view is that ver. 8 is incomplete, and that it ends **ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ**, *i.e.*, "for they were afraid to . . . ". There is no such incompleteness apparent at 2 Cor. ix. 15.

Under these circumstances we fall back on the *primâ facie* case, which is that the Second Epistle to the Corinthians is an *ens integrum*, and we proceed to bring forward some of the positive data which point to its unity.

8. First, attention should be directed to passages in chaps. x.-xiii. which point back to passages in chaps. i.-ix. (*a*) In xi. 15 St. Paul writes that the false apostles, whom he calls Satan's διάκονοι, are trying to pass themselves off as διάκονοι δικαιοσύνης, *i.e.*, as ἀπόστολοι Χριστοῦ (ver. 13). Now there is nothing in the context to suggest such a phrase as διάκονοι δικαιοσύνης, and it does not, as a matter of fact, occur in any other of St. Paul's letters or in the N.T. outside this Epistle or in the LXX. The one passage which explains it is iii. 7-11, where the Ministry of the Old Covenant is declared to be less glorious than that of the New, and where ἡ διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης is set over against ἡ διακονία τῆς κατακρίσεως. Unless the readers of xi. 15 were aware that St. Paul used the phrase "the ministry of Righteousness" as descriptive of the ministry of the Gospel, the title διάκονοι δικαιοσύνης would have had no special meaning for them. Thus we conclude that the discussion of iii. 7-11 is presupposed by the use of the title in xi. 15. (*b*) The charge which his opponents brought against St. Paul at Corinth is thus described by him in xii. 16, ὑπάρχων πανοῦργος δόλῳ ὑμᾶς ἔλαβον. They had called him a πανοῦργος, "a crafty man," and suggested that his dealings in the matter of money were full of guile (δόλος). At iv. 2 he refers to the same charge, μὴ περιπατοῦντες ἐν πανουργίᾳ μηδὲ δολοῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ. The meaning of the latter clause, "handling deceitfully the word of God," is fixed by the parallel in ii. 17, καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, which shows that the δόλος repudiated by him was crooked dealing in regard to money, "making a traffic" of the Gospel. (*c*) The passages just cited from the earlier part of the letter have other echoes in the later part. In ii. 17 those who make merchandise of the word of God at Corinth are οἱ πολλοί, and he speaks of his opponents again as πολλοί in xi. 18. His declaration in ii. 17 is that he preaches ἐξ εἰλικρινείας (*cf.* i. 12), and in iv. 2 that it is τῇ φανερώσει τῆς ἀληθείας; so in xi. 6 he says of himself, ἐν παντὶ φανερώσαντες ἐν πᾶσιν εἰς ὑμᾶς. And, lastly, the asseveration of his sincerity in ii. 17, κατέναντι Θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ λαλοῦμεν, is repeated in xii. 19, the only other place where it occurs in his Epistles. (*d*) In x. 5 he speaks of bringing every thought into captivity, εἰς τὴν ὑπακοὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, and of his readiness to avenge all disobedience, ὅταν πληρωθῇ ὑμῶν ἡ ὑπακοή. Seven verses before, in ix. 13, he had written of the ὑποταγὴ τῆς ὁμολογίας ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ

εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ; and the language is sufficiently similar to suggest that x. 5 was written while the phrases of ix. 13 were still in his mind. (*e*) The concluding summary of the Epistle (xiii. 11) is important (see note *in loc.*). The exhortations χαίρετε . . . παρακαλεῖσθε are specially noteworthy, for they exactly reproduce the two leading thoughts of its earlier part, *Rejoice . . . be comforted.* It is difficult to understand how the words are to be explained on the hypothesis that they sum up the message of the Painful Letter. They are entirely harmonious with chaps. i.-ix., but not harmonious at all with chaps. x.-xiii. "Comfort in affliction" is (as Dr. Plummer points out[1]) the keynote of the first part of the Epistle, "boasting in weakness" being the keynote of the second part. παρακαλεῖσθε is an appropriate summing up of much that is contained in chaps. i.-ix., but is irrelevant as regards chaps. x.-xiii.[2] And thus, as we find in xiii. 11 a summary of 2 Corinthians as a whole, we conclude that it is a single document, and is not made up of parts of two letters which have been joined together by mistake.

9. In the next place the linguistic parallels between chaps. i.-ix. and chaps. x.-xiii. are in many instances so close as to render it difficult to believe that the Epistle is not an *ens integrum.* (*a*) The phrase ἑαυτὸν συνιστάνειν only occurs once in the N.T. outside 2 Corinthians, *viz.*, at Gal. ii. 18, and there the meaning is quite different (παραβάτην ἐμαυτὸν συνιστάνω = "I prove myself a transgressor") from anything in 2 Corinthians. Not only does the phrase occur in both parts of this Epistle (iii. 1, v. 12, x. 12, 18), but it always implies a bad kind of self-commendation, as contrasted with the similar phrase συνιστάνειν ἑαυτὸν (iv. 2, vi. 4, vii. 11), which is used throughout in a favourable sense. (*b*) ὑπόστασις only occurs twice in St. Paul, and each time in the same phrase, ἐν τῇ ὑποστάσει ταύτῃ [*s.c.*, τῆς καυχήσεως], which is found once in the earlier (ix. 4) and once in the later (xi. 17) part of 2 Corinthians. (*c*) St. Paul uses ταπεινός of himself in vii. 6 and x. 1; the word only occurs once again in the Pauline letters (Rom. xii. 16). (*d*) νόημα occurs five times in 2 Corinthians and in both parts of the Epistle (ii. 11, iii. 14, iv. 4, x. 5, xi. 3), and is always used in a bad sense. In the only other place of its occurrence in the N.T. (Phil. iv. 7) there is no suggestion that νοήματα must be bad. (*e*) ἀγρυπνία

[1] Smith's *Bible Dictionary*, vol. i., p. 657.

[2] Semler seems to have had some suspicion of this, for he joins on chap. xiii. 11-13 to the first part of the Epistle in his scheme of dissection.

occurs in vi. 5 and xi. 27, but nowhere else in the N.T. (*f*) προσαναπληροῦν occurs in ix. 12 and xi. 9, but nowhere else in the N.T. (*g*) ἕτοιμος occurs both in ix. 5 and x. 6, 16; only once again in St. Paul (Tit. iii. 1). (*h*) δυνατεῖν is found in ix. 8 and xiii. 3; only once again in St. Paul (Rom. xiv. 4). (*i*) θαρρεῖν occurs in v. 6, 8, vii. 16 and x. 1, 2, but not elsewhere in St. Paul. It is true that in x. 1, 2 it is used to express stern confidence in himself (θαρρῶ εἰς ὑμᾶς), and in vii. 16 to express hopeful confidence in his correspondents (θαρρῶ ἐν ὑμῖν); but this does not alter the fact that he does not use the word in any sense in any other Epistle. (*j*) πλεονεκτεῖν occurs in ii. 11, vii. 2 and xii. 17, 18; only again in St. Paul in 1 Thess. iv. 6. (*k*) παρακαλεῖν occurs thirteen times in chaps. i.-ix. and four times in chaps. x.-xiii.; that is, with unusual frequency in both parts of the Epistle. It is the word used throughout of the Apostle's directions to Titus (viii. 6, 17, ix. 5 and xii. 17). Other words and phrases occur with marked frequency in both parts of the Epistle, such as ἐν παντί, καυχάομαι, περισσότερος (-ως), etc.; but while such phenomena fall in with the conclusion we have already reached, they are hardly significant enough to be registered as supplying independent arguments. But, on the whole, the linguistic facts powerfully support the traditional view, *viz.*, that the Second Epistle to the Corinthians is a single document and not a patchwork of two or more detached pieces.

10. It is further to be borne in mind that neither MSS. nor versions lend any countenance to these disintegrating theories. They all, from the earliest times, treat the Epistle as a whole, as Irenæus explicitly does more than once. He quotes ii. 15, 16 (*Hær.*, IV., xxviii., 3) and xiii. 7, 9 (*Hær.*, V., iii., 1) as alike contained in the *secunda ad Corinthios*. No doubt the union of fragments is supposed to have taken place long before his time. Nevertheless the fact that there is no trace of it in literature is significant. "The attestation of the N.T. text is so varied and so early that a displacement of this magnitude could hardly fail to bear traces of itself." [1]

11. One section of the Epistle (vi. 14-vii. 1) has been regarded as an interpolation by many writers who accept the Epistle in other respects as a complete document from the hand of St. Paul. And it is not to be denied that this section comes in awkwardly in its present place. It is much more like what we would expect a fragment of the Lost Letter (1 Cor. v. 9) to be than a genuine part of the Epistle before us. Nevertheless, I am not satisfied that a case

[1] Sanday, *Encycl. Biblica*, vol. i., p. 906.

has been made out for its rejection; and I have given (in the notes *in loc.*) the reasons which seem to me to justify the Pauline authorship of the section, and plausibly to explain its insertion at this particular point. It is not impossible (though for the hypothesis there is no external authority) that the section is a marginal gloss which has crept into the text at a very early period, or a postscript written in the margin by St. Paul or his amanuensis. But, on the whole, I believe that it ought to be retained.

CHAPTER III.

THE HISTORY STYLE AND CONTENTS OF THE EPISTLE.

1. The external tradition as to the circulation and authority of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians is abundant from the year 175 onward. It is quoted by Irenæus of Gaul repeatedly (*e.g.*, *Hær.*, iii., 7, "aperte Paulum in secunda ad Corinthios dixisse," etc.); by Athenagoras of Athens (*de resurr. morte*, xviii.); by Theophilus of Antioch (*ad Autol.*, i., 12, iii., 14); by Tertullian of Carthage (*de Pudicitia*, 13 *et passim*); by Clement of Alexandria (frequently, *e.g.*, *Strom.*, iii., 14, iv., 6), witnesses representing Churches widely separated from each other. Again, the Epistle is mentioned in the Muratorian Fragment; it was in Marcion's Canon, and there is no evidence that it was absent from any list of N.T. books or any collection of Pauline letters. Before 175 A.D. the evidence is not copious, but it is distinct. The letter to Diognetus (v. 12) quotes chap. vi. 8-10; and the elders cited by Irenæus, who represent (at latest) the generation preceding him, quote chap. xii. 4 (*Hær.*, V., v., 1). Finally, Polycarp (*ad Phil.*, ii., 4, and vi., 1) quotes chap. iv. 14 and viii. 21, thus providing proof of the use of the Epistle before the year 120. That it seems to have been used by the Sethites and and Ophites would point to a similar conclusion.[1]

[1] It is somewhat remarkable that the Epistle is not quoted by Clement of Rome when writing to the Church at Corinth. He cites (§ xlvii.) the First Epistle, and the Second, if known to him, would have supplied him with many apposite texts, powerfully supporting his appeal for unity. But no solid argument can be based on Clement's silence, especially when it is remembered that we should look in vain in his letter for traces of Galatians, Colossians, Philippians, and 1 and 2 Thessalonians, as well as of 2 Corinthians. These letters may not have been known in Rome at the time; or Clement may have been personally unacquainted with them; or he may not have been familiar enough with their contents to quote from them. Any of these explanations is adequate, without resorting to the hypothesis (*cf.* Kennedy, *2 and 3 Corinthians*, p. 142 ff.) that Clement does not quote the canonical 2 Corinthians because it was not yet in existence as a whole, but only survived in the form of fragments of the great Apostle's correspondence with Corinth.

2. External evidence is, however, of little importance in the case of a letter which so clearly betrays its authorship as 2 Corinthians does. It is unmistakably Pauline, in the tone and character of its teaching, no less than in its style and vocabulary. No Epistle lets us see more of the working of the Apostle's mind, or gives us a clearer view of his personality (see above, chap. i., § 1). It is distinctively a *letter* rather than an *epistle;* that is, it was written to meet an emergency that had arisen at Corinth, and there is no trace that the writer was conscious that it would take a permanent place in literature. Herein lies at once its charm and its difficulty; and herein, too, is the explanation of the absence of systematic and consistent arrangement, such as might fairly be expected in a formal treatise. It reflects the varying moods of the writer; and the broken constructions and frequent anacolutha show that it was written at a time of mental agitation and excitement.

3. We count it unnecessary to produce here the proofs of the Pauline character of the style and diction of the Epistle.[1] They are apparent throughout, and the marginal references to the text have been specially prepared with a view of bringing out the linguistic parallels between 2 Corinthians and the other Pauline letters.[2] Among the words peculiar in the N.T. to this Epistle are the following: ἀβαρής, ἀγανάκτησις, ἁγνότης, ἀγρυπνία, ἀδρότης, ἄμετρος, ἀνακαλύπτειν, ἀνεκδιήγητος, ἀπαρασκεύαστος, ἀπειπεῖν, ἀπόκριμα, ἄρρητος, αὐγάζειν, αὐθαίρετος, βελίαρ, δίψος, δόλιος, δυσφημία, ἐγκρίνειν, ἐκδαπανᾶσθαι, ἐκδημεῖν, ἐκφοβεῖν, ἐλαφρία, ἐντυποῦν, ἐπενδύεσθαι, ἑτεροζυγεῖν, εὐφημία, ἱκανότης, καθαίρεσις, κάλυμμα, καπηλεύειν, καταβαρεῖν, κατάκρισις, καταναρκεῖν, κατάρτισις, κατοπτρίζεσθαι, μετοχή, μολυσμός, μωμεῖσθαι, νυχθήμερον, ὀχύρωμα, παραυτίκα, παραφρονεῖν, πεντάκις, πέρυσι, προαμαρτάνειν, προενάρχεσθαι, προκαταρτίζειν, προσαναπληροῦν, προσκοπή, πτωχεύειν, σαργάνη, σκῆνος, σκόλοψ, στενοχωρεῖσθαι, συγκατάθεσις, συλᾶν, συμπέμπειν, συμφώνησις, συναποστέλλειν, συνυπουργεῖν, συστατικός, ὑπερέκεινα, ὑπερεκτείνειν, ὑπερλίαν, φειδομένως, φωτισμός, ψευδαπόστολος, ψιθυρισμός.

4. That the Epistle falls of itself into three parts is evident to the most casual reader. (1) From i. 1 to vii. 16 the writer is

[1] Those who desire to learn what has been urged against the Pauline authorship may be referred to Dr. Knowling's *Witness of the Epistles*, chap. ii., "Recent Attacks upon the Hauptbriefe"; see especially p. 192. But it is quite outside the plan of this commentary to take notice of every extravagance of criticism. (See also vol. ii., p. 753 above.)

[2] Note that in the marginal references the LXX numbering of the Psalms and of the other O.T. books has been followed; and that "here only" means that the word so designated does not occur again in the N.T.

occupied with the reflections which are suggested by the report brought by Titus as to the response of the Corinthian Church to the injunctions of the First Epistle in the matter of the incestuous man. In this section there is a digression of great doctrinal importance on the Ministry of the New Covenant (iii. 7-iv. 15), followed by some profound thoughts about the life after death (iv. 16-v. 10); and a minor digression (vi. 14-vii. 1) about the dangers of intermarriage with the heathen; but the main topic of these chapters is his thankfulness at the news he has received, which consoles him in his many troubles. Again and again he bids them be sure of his sincerity and single-mindedness. (2) Chapters viii. and ix. deal with the collection which was being made for the poor Christians in Judæa, a subject which had been much in his thoughts during the preceding year. (3) The last four chapters are taken up with a vindication of his apostolic authority, which was necessary to put forward plainly before his next visit to Corinth. There was a party in that city calling themselves by the name of Christ (x. 7), who made light of St. Paul's apostolic claims and were trying to undermine his authority. The Church as a whole had acquiesced in St. Paul's directions given in 1 Cor. v.; but a minority of malcontents were troublesome and calumnious, and needed repression. A detailed analysis of the letter is subjoined.

ANALYSIS OF THE EPISTLE.

I. The obedience of the Corinthians to the instructions of the First Epistle.

Introductory—
- Address (i. 1, 2).
- God's consolations and the sympathy of sorrow (i. 3-7).
- His recent peril (i. 8-11).

His sincerity of purpose—
- They must acknowledge it (i. 12-14).
- His change of plan was not due to fickleness (i. 15-22).
- The real reason of the postponement of his visit (i. 23-ii. 4).

The offender has been sufficiently punished (ii. 5-11).

He rejoices to hear that his reproof has been loyally received (ii. 12-17).

The Corinthians are his "Letter of Commendation" (iii. 1-3).

His success, however, is due to God (iii. 4-6).

Digression on the Ministry of the New Covenant—
- It is more glorious than that of the Old (iii. 7-11).
- It is more open (iii. 12-18).
- He, accordingly, delivers his message plainly (iv. 1-6).

His bodily weakness does not annul the effects of his ministry (iv. 7-15).
He is sustained by a glorious hope (iv. 16-18).
His expectation of a glorified body hereafter, and his desire to survive until the Second Advent (v. 1-5).
In any case to be with Christ is best (v. 6-8).
We must remember the Judgment to come (v. 9, 10).
He reiterates his sincerity of purpose (v. 11-13).
The constraining power of his ministry (v. 14-16).
In Christ all is new (v. 17-19).
As Christ's ambassador he prays them to be reconciled to God (v. 20-vi. 3).
The conditions and characteristics of his ministry (vi. 4-10).
He affectionately declares his sympathy and claims the same from them (vi. 11-13).
[Parenthetical warning against familiar association with the heathen (vi. 14-vii. 1).]
He claims their sympathy again (vii. 2-4).
He repeats his joy that his reproof has been loyally received (vii. 5-12).
Titus also rejoiced to bring such tidings (vii. 13-16).

II. The Collection for the Judæan Christians.

The liberality of the Macedonian Churches (viii. 1-7).
He counsels, though he will not command, the imitation of it (viii. 8-15).
The mission of Titus and his two companions (viii. 16-24).
Its purpose, that the collection may be made ready (ix. 1-5).
Liberal giving is (*a*) blessed of God (ix. 6-11), and (*b*) calls forth the blessings of the recipients (ix. 12-15).

III. The Vindication of his Apostolic Authority.

He entreats them not to force him to use his authority (x. 1-6).
Despite all appearances it is weighty and is Divinely given him (x. 7-18).
He begs them to bear with the statement of his claims at length (xi. 1-4).
He is in no way inferior to his adversaries (xi. 5-15).
His Apostolic labours and trials (xi. 16-33).
His vision, of which he could boast, if he chose (xii. 1-6).
His "thorn in the flesh" (xii. 7-10).
This testimony should have proceeded from the Corinthians (xii. 11-13).
That he did not claim maintenance was disinterested (xii. 14-18).
The purpose of this "glorying" is their edification (xii. 19-21).
If he comes again, he will not spare (xiii. 1, 2).
Christ is his strength: let them see to it that He is theirs also (xiii. 3-10).
Conclusion—
Final exhortations (xiii. 11).
Salutations and benediction (xiii. 12, 13).

CHAPTER IV.

THE TEXT.

1. The uncial manuscripts whose readings are cited, in all important cases, in the critical notes are the following:—

א. Codex Sinaiticus (sæc. iv.), now at St. Petersburg, published in facsimile type by its discoverer, Tischendorf, in 1862. The symbol א^{c} is used to indicate the corrections introduced by a scribe of the seventh century, א* denoting the autograph of the original scribe.

A. Codex Alexandrinus (sæc. v.), at the British Museum, published in photographic facsimile by Sir E. M. Thompson (1879); it is defective from chaps. iv. 13 to xii. 7 of our Epistle.

B. Codex Vaticanus (sæc. iv.), published in photographic facsimile in 1889 under the care of the Abbate Cozza-Luzi.

C. Codex Ephraemi (sæc. v.), the Paris palimpsest, edited by Tischendorf in 1843. The text of our Epistle is wanting from chap. x. 8 to the end.

D. Codex Claromontanus (sæc. vi.), a Græco-Latin MS. at Paris, edited by Tischendorf in 1852. D^{b} and D^{c} denote the readings introduced by correctors of the seventh and ninth centuries respectively. The Latin text is represented by d; it follows the Old Latin version with modifications.

E. Codex Sangermanensis (sæc. ix.), a Græco-Latin MS., now at St. Petersburg, formerly belonging to the Abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Prés. Its text is largely dependent upon that of D. The Latin version, e (a corrected copy of d), has been printed, but with incomplete accuracy, by Belsheim (1885).

F. Codex Augiensis (sæc. ix.), a Græco-Latin MS., at Trinity College, Cambridge, edited by Scrivener in 1859. Its Greek text is almost identical with that of G, and it is therefore

not cited save where it differs from that MS. Its Latin version, f, presents the Vulgate text with some modifications.

G. Codex Boernerianus (sæc. ix.), a Græco-Latin MS., at Dresden, edited by Matthæi in 1791. Written by an Irish scribe, it once formed part of the same volume as Codex Sangallensis (δ) of the Gospels. The Latin text, g, is based on the O.L. translation.

H. Codex Coislinianus (sæc. vi.), fragments of which survive in several libraries. Of our Epistle chap. iv. 2-7 is at St. Petersburg, and chaps. x. 18-xi. 6 and xi. 12-xii. 2 at Mount Athos. These latter fragments were edited by Duchesne in 1876; the readings of the former are given by Tischendorf.

K. Codex Mosquensis (sæc. ix.), edited by Matthæi in 1782.

L. Codex Angelicus (sæc. ix.), at Rome, collated by Tischendorf and others.

M. Codex Ruber (sæc. ix.), at the British Museum; it derives its name from the colour of the ink. It contains of this Epistle chaps. i. 1-15 and x. 13-xii. 5.

O. This is a fragment (sæc. vi.), at St. Petersburg, containing chaps. i. 20-ii. 12.

P. Codex Porphyrianus (sæc. ix.), at St. Petersburg, collated by Tischendorf. Its text is deficient for chap. ii. 13-16.

R. Codex Cryptoferratensis (sæc. vii.), a palimpsest fragment containing chap. xi. 9-19, edited by Cozza in 1867, and cited by Tischendorf.[1]

The tendency of these MSS. to fall into groups will be apparent on a cursory inspection of the *apparatus criticus*. The readings of DEG are, as a rule, "Western"; while ℵB represent (as usual) a weight of authority that cannot be rejected without much hesitation. The lacunæ in A and C prevent the affinities of the "Alexandrian" group ℵACLP from being as apparent here as in other Epistles (*cf.* Sanday-Headlam, *Romans*, p. lxxi).

[1] The following uncial authorities for our Epistle are as yet inedited:—

S. At Mount Athos (sæc. viii.?), contains, *inter alia*, chaps. i. 1-xi. 23.

Ψ. A ninth-century Codex at Mount Athos. It is said to be complete.

ב. Codex Patiriensis (sæc. v.), at Rome (Vat. Gr. 2061). It contains chaps. iv. 7-vi. 8 and vii. 15-x. 6 of our Epistle.

2. The minuscule or cursive manuscripts are very numerous, and only a few of special interest are occasionally cited in the critical apparatus. 17, the "queen of cursives" (sæc. ix.), is at Paris; 37 (sæc. xv.) is the well-known Leicester Codex = Ev. 69; and 73 (sæc. xi.) is at Upsala.

3. *Versions.* Of these the Latin claims special attention. The versions d, e, f, g have been described above. We have also of the Old Latin the fragmentary Codex Frisingensis (r) of the sixth (?) century, containing of our Epistle chaps. i. 1-ii. 10, iii. 17-v. 1, vii. 10-viii. 12, ix. 10-xi. 21, xii. 14-21, xiii. 2-10. The symbol m marks the readings found in the *Speculum*, which represents the text of the Spaniard Priscillian. The Vulgate (vg) of the Pauline Epistles differs but little from the præ-Hieronymian Latin.

In Syriac we have the Peshitto (sæc. iii.?) and the Harclean version (sæc. vii.). The margin of the latter often preserves better readings than are found in its text.

Of Egyptian versions we have the Bohairic or the North Coptic, and the Sahidic or South Coptic, the language of Upper Egypt. These versions are to be dated probably about the third century.

It has not come within the scope of this edition to cite the patristic authorities for the variants recorded; for a full conspectus the student must be referred to Tischendorf's *Novum Testamentum Græce* (8th edit.), on which the following *apparatus criticus* is based.

4. In accordance with the general plan of the *Expositor's Greek Testament* the "received text" (see vol. i., p. 52) is printed at the head of the page; but the commentary follows the reading, which has appeared to the editor to be, on the whole, most probably original.

Among the Patristic Commentaries on the Epistle perhaps the most important are those of Chrysostom, Ambrosiaster and Primasius. Modern commentaries are very numerous. Stanley's notes are often illuminating and picturesque; Alford is careful and thorough, as usual; and Waite (in the *Speaker's Commentary*) provides a useful discussion of the main questions which the Epistle suggests. Of German commentaries Schmiedel's (in the *Hand Kommentar*) is by far the most complete. It is a brilliant and scholarly piece of work, and is indispensable to the student who wishes to have detailed information as to the various schemes by which St. Paul's history has been reconstructed for the years 53-55 A.D. Schmiedel's general view (see p. 19 above) that chaps. x.-xiii. constitute part of a letter distinct from and later than chaps. i.-ix. has not commended itself to the present editor; but his notes are full of

learning and suggestiveness. Schnedermann's edition of the Epistles to the Corinthians (in Strack-Zöckler's *Kommentar*) has also been found useful at some points. Bengel's *Gnomon* and Field's detached *Notes* have, of course, been diligently consulted.[1]

In this edition the interpretation which has seemed on the whole the best has been set down, without (as a rule) discussing at length the rival theories. It would have been easy to crowd the notes with references to other editors; but it has seemed better to economise space in this direction, and so to find room for a larger number of references to St. Paul's other writings.

September, 1900.

[1] See also Prof. Findlay's account of the Commentaries on 1 Corinthians vol. ii., p. 752 above).

ΠΑΥΛΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΥ

Η ΠΡΟΣ

ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ

ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ ΔΕΥΤΕΡΑ.

Ι. 1. ΠΑΥΛΟΣ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,[1] [a]διὰ [a]θελήματος [a]Θεοῦ, καὶ Τιμόθεος ὁ ἀδελφὸς, τῇ [b]ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ [b]Θεοῦ τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ,

[a] Rom. xv. 32; 1 Cor. i. 1; chap. viii. 5; Eph. i. 1; Col. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 1.

[b] Acts xx. 28; 1 Cor. i. 2; 1 Thess. ii. 14, etc.

[1] ADEGKL and most vss. have Ἰησ. Χρ.; better Χριστου Ἰησου with ℵBMP 17.

CHAPTER I. ADDRESS, vv. 1, 2.—The usual form of address at the beginning of a Greek letter was A. B. **χαίρειν** (see Acts xxiii. 26); and this is adopted by St. James in his Epistle (Jas. i. 1), and is followed, among other Christian writers, by Ignatius in his letters (**πλεῖστα χαίρειν** is his ordinary formula). St. Paul, original in this as in all else, struck out a form for himself. He replaces **χαίρειν** by **χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη** (1 Thess.), which in subsequent letters is expressed more fully, as here, **χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.** (In 1 and 2 Tim. he adds **ἔλεος**.) The simple greeting of ordinary courtesy is thus filled with a deep religious meaning. *Grace* is the keynote of the Gospel; and *peace*, the traditional and beautiful salutation of the East, on Christian lips signifies not earthly peace merely, but the peace of God (Phil. iv. 7). The first instance of the combination of **χάρις** with **εἰρήνη** is noteworthy, *viz.*, they are coupled in the Priestly Benediction at Num. vi. 24.—**ἀπόστολος Χρ. Ἰη.**: St. Paul's letters are all semi-official, except perhaps that to Philemon; and thus they usually begin with the assertion of his apostolic office. This it would be especially necessary to emphasise in a letter to Corinth, where his authority had been questioned quite recently (x. 10 ff.), and where the names of Apollos and Peter had formerly been set in opposition to his (1 Cor. i. 12).—**διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ**: he is ever anxious (see reff.) to explain that his apostleship was not assumed of himself; it is a *mission* from God; he is a **σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς.**—**καὶ Τιμόθεος ὁ ἀδελφός**: Timothy now occupies the place at St. Paul's side which was filled by Sosthenes when 1 *Cor.* was written (1 Cor. i. 1). Timothy had been despatched to Macedonia (Acts xix. 22) to go on to Corinth (1 Cor. iv. 17), but St. Paul seems to have had a suspicion that he might be prevented from arriving there (1 Cor. xvi. 10). From the facts that we now find him in Macedonia, and that there is no mention of him in chap. xii. 16-18, it is likely that he was prevented from reaching Corinth by some causes of which we are unaware.—**τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ.**: the letter is addressed primarily to the Christian congregation at Corinth, and secondarily to the Christians throughout Achaia. It is thus a circular letter, like that to the Galatians or Ephesians, and so at the end we do not find salutations to individuals, as in 1 *Cor.* and in the other letters addressed to particular Churches. The words **τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ** suggest the idea of *settled* establishment; the Church at Corinth had now been for some time in existence.—**ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ**: the

σὺν τοῖς [e] ἁγίοις πᾶσι τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ· 2. χάρις ὑμῖν
καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.
3. [d] Εὐλογητὸς ὁ [e] Θεὸς καὶ [e] πατὴρ τοῦ [e] Κυρίου ἡμῶν [e] Ἰησοῦ
[e] Χριστοῦ, ὁ πατὴρ τῶν [f] οἰκτιρμῶν καὶ [g] Θεὸς πάσης [g] παρακλήσεως,
4. ὁ [h] παρακαλῶν ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ [i] θλίψει ἡμῶν, εἰς τὸ δύνασθαι
ἡμᾶς παρακαλεῖν τοὺς ἐν πάσῃ θλίψει, διὰ τῆς παρακλήσεως ἧς

c Acts ix. 13; 1 Cor. xvi. 1; chap. viii. 4, ix. 12; Phil. i. 1, etc.
d Ps. lxxxviii. 53; Lk. i. 68; Rom. i. 25, ix. 5, etc.
e Rom. xv. 6; Eph. i. 3; chap. xi. 31; 1 Pet. i. 3.
f Isa. lxiii. 15, 16; Rom. xii. 1.
g Rom. xv. 5; Phil. ii. 1; 2 Thess. ii. 16.
h Isa. li. 12, lxvi. 13.
i Ver. 8; chaps. ii. 4, iv. 17, vi. 4, viii. 2, 13.

Roman province of Achaia included the whole country which we call Greece (excluding Macedonia), and it is in this large sense that the name is used here (*cf.* ix. 2 below).

Ver. 2. **ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς κ.τ.λ.**: this coupling of the names of *God our Father* and *the Lord Jesus Christ* as alike the source of *grace and peace* is most significant in its bearing upon St. Paul's Christology (*cf.* xiii. 13).

I. The Obedience of the Corinthians to the Instructions of the First Epistle (i. 3—vii. 16). This is the main topic of the first section of this Epistle. Vv. 3-7: THANKSGIVING; GOD'S CONSOLATIONS AND THE SYMPATHY OF SORROW. St. Paul's habit is to begin his letters with an expression of thankfulness for the Christian progress of his correspondents. The only exceptions are the Epp. to Titus and to the Galatians (in this case he had received bad news from Galatia). In 1 Tim. i. 12 the cause of his thankfulness is the exhibition of the Divine mercy to himself; and this Epistle begins with a like thought, from which he passes (ver. 14) to his confident belief that the Corinthian Christians are still his **καύχημα**. It was especially important that a letter which was so largely taken up with rebuke and with the assertion of his apostolical authority should begin with a message of sympathy and hopefulness (vv. 11 ff.).

Ver. 3. **εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ.**: *blessed is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.* Note that **τοῦ Κυρίου** is dependent on **Θεός** as well as on **πατήρ**; *cf.* Eph. i. 17, and John xx. 17, Rev. i. 6. This is the starting-point of the Christian revelation, that the Supreme is "the God and Father" of Jesus Christ; He is **εὐλογητός** (בָּרוּךְ), the Object of His creatures' blessing. The verb is not expressed, but the analogy of 1 Pet. iv. 11 would indicate that **ἐστίν** rather than **ἔστω** should be understood. A doxology is not a prayer, but (*cf.* Matt. vi. 13, and John xii. 13, a close parallel) a thankful and adoring statement of the Divine goodness and power.—**ὁ πατὴρ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν**: *the Father of mercies, sc.*, from whom merciful acts proceed; **οἰκτιρμός**, *compassion*, is the very characteristic of a Father's providence; see reff. and Luke vi. 36.—**καὶ Θεὸς πάσης παρακλήσεως**: *and God of all comfort, sc.*, from whom every consolation proceeds. We have **παράκλησις** applied to God in O.T., *e.g.*, in Ps. xciii. 19, **αἱ παρακλήσεις σου ἠγάπησαν τὴν ψυχήν μου**; and the word is adopted in the N.T. for the Divine comfort not only by St. Paul (see reff.), but by St. Luke (ii. 25 and Acts ix. 31), and by St. John, who describes alike the Spirit (John xiv. 16, xv. 26, xvi. 7) and the Son (1 John ii. 1) as the **παράκλητος**.

Ver. 4. **ὁ παρακαλῶν ἡμᾶς κ.τ.λ.**: *who comforteth us in all our affliction* (the def. art. indicating trials actually existing). The verb **παρακαλεῖν** has three shades of meaning, (*a*) *to beseech*, eighteen times in St. Paul, (*b*) *to exhort*, seventeen times, (*c*) *to comfort*, thirteen times, of which seven are in this Epistle, where the word occurs altogether seventeen times. *Cf.* ver. 6, ii. 7, 8, v. 20, vi. 1, vii. 6, 7, 13, viii. 6, ix. 5, x. 1, xii. 8, 18, xiii. 11.—**εἰς τὸ δύνασθαι κ.τ.λ.**: *to the end that we may be able to comfort them that are in any affliction* (*sc.*, any that may happen to arise). This is the final purpose of God's gifts of grace, *viz.*, that they may not only be a blessing to the individual, but through him and as reflected from him to his fellows.—**ἧς παρακαλούμεθα**: *through the comfort wherewith we ourselves are being comforted of God.* **ἧς**, for **ἣν**, has been attracted into the case of **παρακλήσεως** (*cf.* 1 Cor. vi. 19, chap. x. 13, Eph. ii. 10).

Ver. 5. **ὅτι καθὼς περισσεύει κ.τ.λ.**: *for as Christ's sufferings flow over abundantly to us, even so our comfort also aboundeth through Christ.* That the Christian is a fellow-sufferer with Christ is frequently urged by St. Paul (Rom.

παρακαλούμεθα αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ· 5. ὅτι καθὼς περισσεύει τὰ παθήματα[1] τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς, οὕτω διὰ Χριστοῦ[2] περισσεύει καὶ ἡ παράκλησις ἡμῶν. 6. εἴτε δὲ [k]θλιβόμεθα, [k]ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν παρακλήσεως καὶ σωτηρίας,[3] τῆς ἐνεργουμένης ἐν [l]ὑπομονῇ τῶν αὐτῶν παθημάτων ὧν καὶ ἡμεῖς πάσχομεν· εἴτε παρακαλούμεθα, ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν παρακλήσεως καὶ σωτηρίας[4]· 7. καὶ ἡ ἐλπὶς ἡμῶν [m]βεβαία ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν· εἰδότες ὅτι ὥσπερ[5] [n]κοινωνοί ἐστε τῶν παθημάτων, οὕτω

k *Cf.* Chap. iv. 15; Eph. iii. 13; 2 Tim. ii. 10. l Chaps. vi. 4, xii. 12. m Rom. iv. 16; *cf.* ver. 21. n 1 Cor. x. 18; 1 Pet. v. 1; 2 Pet. i. 4.

[1] DE have **το παθημα.**

[2] The uncials have **του Χριστου**; **του** is omitted by a few minuscules only.

[3] B 17 omit the first **και σωτηριας.**

[4] The order of clauses in the latter part of the verse is variously given in the MSS. The received text (followed by the A.V.) is devoid of MS. authority and was manufactured by Erasmus. The choice lies between (1) **ειτε παρακαλουμεθα υπερ της υμων παρακλησεως** (omitting **και σωτηριας**) **της ενεργουμενης εν υπομονη των αυτων παθηματων ων και ημεις πασχομεν και η ελπις . . . υμων,** which is attested by ℵACMP, r, the Peshitto and Bohairic vss.; and (2) **της ενεργουμενης εν υπομονη των αυτων παθηματων ων και ημεις πασχομεν, και η ελπις ημων βεβαια υπερ υμων· ειτε παρακαλουμεθα, υπερ της υμων παρακλησεως και σωτηριας,** which is the order of BDEGKL, d, e, f, g, and the Harclean. We follow (1), which is adopted by Tisch., W.H. and the R.V.

[5] For **ωσπερ** (D^{b}cKL, etc.) read **ως,** with ℵABCD*E*MP, etc.

viii. 17, Phil. iii. 10, Col. i. 24; see esp. chap. iv. 10, 11 below, and *cf.* Matt. xx. 22). Here he dwells on the thought that this fellowship in suffering implies also the consolation and strength which flow from union with Christ; *cf.* 1 Pet. iv. 13.

Vv. 6, 7. We follow the reading of the Revisers (see crit. note) and translate: *But whether we be afflicted, it is for your comfort and salvation; or whether we be comforted, it is for your comfort, which worketh in the patient endurance of the same things which we also suffer: and our hope for you is steadfast; knowing that as ye are partakers of the sufferings, so also are ye of the comfort.* This is an expansion of the **εἰς τὸ δύνασθαι κ.τ.λ.** of ver. 4: the Apostle's afflictions and consolations alike are for the sake of his converts; they and he have a common fellowship in Christ, with all which that involves of sympathy with each other. The nearest parallel (see reff.) is Eph. iii. 13, **διὸ αἰτοῦμαι μὴ ἐνκακεῖν ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσίν μου ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, ἥτις ἐστὶν δόξα ὑμῶν.** For the constr. **εἴτε . . . εἴτε** *cf.* chap. v. 13 and 1 Cor. xii. 26. Note that **ἐνεργεῖσθαι** is always in the N.T. *middle*, not *passive*, and is used intransitively (see Rom. vii. 5, chap. iv. 12, Gal. v. 6, Eph. iii. 20, Col. i. 29, 1 Thess. ii. 13); when the verb is used of God it is always in the active voice (1 Cor. xii. 6, Gal. ii. 8, etc.).—**ἐν ὑπομονῇ**: **ὑπομονή** means *expectation* or *hopeful waiting* in the canonical books of the LXX; but is often used for *steadfast endurance* in Ecclus. and in 4 Macc. (see 4 Macc. xvii. 12). It is a favourite word with St. Paul in this latter sense, in which it is always used in the N.T. (*cf.*, *e.g.*, Luke xxi. 19, 1 Tim. vi. 11); for the juxtaposition of **ὑπομονή** and **παράκλησις** see Rom. xv. 5.—**τῶν αὐτῶν παθημάτων**: the sufferings which the Corinthian brethren must endure are here represented as *the same* as those of the Apostle; *i.e.*, the reference is not to any special affliction such as that alluded to in ver. 8, but to the troubles which came upon him in the general discharge of his Apostolic office and upon all those who were engaged in the struggle against Judaism on the one side and heathendom on the other.

Ver. 7. **καὶ ἡ ἐλπὶς κ.τ.λ.**: *and our hope for you is steadfast, knowing* (we should expect **εἰδότων,** but *cf.* Rom. xiii. 11) *that as ye are partakers of the sufferings* (see reff. for **κοινωνός** with a *gen. objecti*), *so also are ye of the comfort.* The main idea of this section is well given by Bengel: "Communio sanctorum . . . egregie representatur in hac epistola".

Vv. 8-11. His Recent Peril. Ver. 8. **οὐ γὰρ θέλομεν κ.τ.λ.**: *for we would not have you ignorant, brethren, about* (for **ὑπέρ** with gen. in this sense, *cf.*

καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως. 8. οὐ γὰρ θέλομεν ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί,
ὑπὲρ[1] τῆς θλίψεως ἡμῶν τῆς γενομένης ἡμῖν[2] ἐν τῇ [o]Ἀσίᾳ, ὅτι καθ'
[p] ὑπερβολὴν [q] ἐβαρήθημεν[3] ὑπὲρ δύναμιν, ὥστε [r] ἐξαπορηθῆναι ἡμᾶς
καὶ τοῦ ζῆν· 9. ἀλλὰ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς τὸ [s] ἀπόκριμα τοῦ θανάτου
ἐσχήκαμεν, ἵνα μὴ [t] πεποιθότες ὦμεν [t] ἐφ' [t] ἑαυτοῖς, ἀλλ' [u] ἐπὶ τῷ
Θεῷ τῷ [v] ἐγείροντι[4] τοὺς νεκρούς· 10. ὃς ἐκ τηλικούτου θανάτου
[w] ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς καὶ ῥύεται,[5] [x] εἰς ὃν [x] ἠλπίκαμεν ὅτι[6] καὶ ἔτι[7]

o Acts xix. 22; 1 Cor. xv. 32. p Rom. vii. 13; 1 Cor. xii. 31; chaps. iv. 7, 17, xii. 7; Gal. i. 13 only. q Chap. v. 4; 1 Tim. v. 16. r Chap. iv. 8 only. s Here only. t Lk. xviii. 9. u Ps. ii. 12; Jer. xvii. 7. v Chap. iv. 14; Rom. viii. 11; 1 Cor. vi. 14, etc. w Rom. vii. 24; Col. i. 13; 1 Thess. i. 10. x John v. 45; 1 Pet. iii. 5.

[1] BKLM have **υπερ της θλ.**, probably the autograph; but **περι** (a natural alteration) has the support of ℵACDEGP 17.

[2] ℵcDbcEKL, the Syriac and Bohairic give **ημιν**; om. **ημιν** ℵ*ABCD*GMP 17 and the Latins.

[3] DEGKL, d, e, f, g, vg. and the Syriac vss. give **εβαρ. υπερ δυν.**; better **υπερ δυναμιν εβαρηθημεν**, with ℵABCMP 17, r.

[4] G has **επι Θεον τον εγιροντα.**

[5] DcEGKLM, f, vg. and the Harclean give **ρυεται**; **ρυσεται** has the stronger support of ℵBCP 17, g, and the Bohairic.

[6] **οτι** is omitted in BD*M; G, g insert it after **και**; all other authorities support received text.

[7] DbG and a few cursives omit **ετι.**

chap. viii. 23, xii. 8, 2 Thess. ii. 1) *our affliction which happened in Asia, that we were weighed down exceedingly, beyond our power, insomuch that we despaired even of life.* Having spoken in general terms of the Divine comfort in times of trouble, he goes on to mention his own particular case, the "affliction which befel him in Asia". What was this? *Asia* almost certainly means *Ephesus*, where he had lately been exposed to many adversaries (1 Cor. xv. 32, xvi. 9). We naturally think of the tumult recorded in Acts xix. 23 ff.; but the language here used is so strong that he must have been exposed to something worse than a temporary riot. He was "weighed down beyond his power" (**ὑπὲρ δύναμιν**, a phrase which he never uses elsewhere, and which is specially remarkable from the pen of one who always gloried in the Divine **δύναμις** granted to him, of which he said **πάντα ἰσχύω ἐν τῷ ἐνδυναμοῦντί με**, Phil. iv. 13); he "despaired of life," and yet he describes in this very Epistle (iv. 8) his general attitude in tribulation as "perplexed, yet *not* despairing". Nor have we knowledge of any persecution at Ephesus so violent as to justify such language, though no doubt the allusion *may* be to something of the kind. Whatever the "affliction" was, the Corinthians were acquainted with it, for St. Paul does not enter into details, but mentions it only to inform them of its gravity, and to assure them of his trust in his ultimate deliverance. On the whole, it seems most likely that the reference is to grievous bodily sickness, which brought the Apostle down to the gates of death (see ver. 9, and *cf.* chap. iv. 10 and xii. 7 ff.). Such an affliction would be truly **ὑπὲρ δύναμιν**; and it would be necessary to contemplate its recurrence (ver. 10). St. Paul in this Epistle, with unusual frequency, uses the plural **ἡμεῖς** when speaking of himself; sometimes this can be explained by the fact that Timothy was associated with him in the writing of the letter (i. 1), but in other passages (*e.g.*, ver. 10, v. 13, 16, x. 7, 11, 15, xi. 21) such an explanation will not suit the context, which demands the individual application of the pronoun.

Ver. 9. **ἀλλὰ αὐτοὶ κ.τ.λ.**: *nay, we ourselves had the sentence of death in ourselves; i.e.*, the danger was so great that the sentence of death had been already pronounced, as it were. **ἀπόκριμα** might mean "answer," as the Revisers translate it (they give *sentence*, with the A.V., in their margin); *cf.* the verb **ἀποκρίνειν**. But in the other places where this rare word is found (*e.g.*, Jos., *Ant.*, xiv. 10, 6, and an inscription of 51 A.D., quoted by Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 85) it stands for an official *decision* or *sentence*. *Cf.* **κρίμα θανάτου**, "the sen-

[y] ῥύσεται, 11. [z] συνυπουργούντων καὶ ὑμῶν [1] ὑπὲρ [2] ἡμῶν [3] τῇ δεήσει, ἵνα ἐκ πολλῶν [a] προσώπων [4] τὸ εἰς ἡμᾶς χάρισμα διὰ πολλῶν [b] εὐχαριστηθῇ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν.[5]

12. Ἡ γὰρ [c] καύχησις ἡμῶν αὕτη ἐστί, τὸ μαρτύριον τῆς [d] συνειδήσεως ἡμῶν, ὅτι ἐν ἁπλότητι [6] καὶ [e] εἰλικρινείᾳ Θεοῦ,[7] οὐκ [8] ἐν σοφίᾳ σαρκικῇ, ἀλλ' ἐν χάριτι Θεοῦ [f] ἀνεστράφημεν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, περισσοτέρως δὲ πρὸς ὑμᾶς.

y 2 Tim. iv. 17, 18. z Here only. a Prov. viii. 30 and reff. below. b Chaps. iv. 15, ix. 12. c 1 Cor. xv. 31; chaps. vii. 4, 14, viii. 24, xi. 10, 17. d Eccl. x. 20; Wisd. xvii. 11 only in LXX; *cf.* Rom. ii. 15. e 1 Cor. v. 8; chap. ii. 17 only; *cf.* Phil. i. 10. f Ezek. xix. 6; Eph. ii. 3; 1 Tim. iii. 15.

[1] A has ημων for υμων.

[2] D*G have περι for υπερ.

[3] AG have υμων for ημων.

[4] GM, d, e, g, give εν πολλῳ προσωπῳ.

[5] ευχ. υπερ ημων is read by ℵACD*GM 17 and the vss.; BDcEFKLP have υμων.

[6] απλοτητι ℵcDEGL, the Latin and Syriac vss.; but the better supported reading is αγιοτητι of ℵ*ABCKMP 17, 37, 73, and the Bohairic (see note).

[7] ℵABCDEM have του Θεου; GKLP omit του.

[8] BM 37, 73, f, vg. and the Harclean read και ουκ εν; W.H. place και in brackets.

tence of death" (Ecclus. xli. 3). The tense of **ἐσχήκαμεν** is noteworthy; it seems to be a kind of historical perfect, used like an aorist (*cf.* chap. ii. 13, xi. 25, Rev. v. 7, viii. 5, for a similar usage).—**ἵνα μὴ πεποιθότες κ.τ.λ.**: *i.e.*, "the gravity of the danger was such as to impress upon me the vanity of putting my trust anywhere save in God, who has the power of life and death". God can "raise the dead" (see chap. iv. 14); much more can He bring back the dying from the gates of death.

Ver. 10. **ὅς ἐκ τηλικ. κ.τ.λ.**: *who delivered us out of so great a death, and will deliver* (reading **ῥύσεται**). The form of words recalls Rom. xv. 31 and 2 Tim. iv. 17, 18, which would give some support to the theory that the great peril in question was persecution at the hands of opponents; but (as we have said on ver. 8) it seems more probable that the Apostle's deliverance was from a dangerous illness. It is possible, indeed, that we have here a reminiscence of Job xxxiii. 30, **ἐρύσατο τὴν ψυχήν μου ἐκ θανάτου**, which would confirm this interpretation. Note that the preposition is **ἐκ**, not **ἀπό**; **ἀπό** would only indicate *deliverance from the neighbourhood of* a danger; **ἐκ** indicates *emergence from* a danger to which one has actually been exposed (see Chase, *Lord's Prayer in the Early Church*, pp. 71 ff.). *Cf.* with the whole phrase 2 Tim. iv. 17, 18, **ἐρύσθην ἐκ στόματος λέοντος, ῥύσεταί με ὁ κύριος κ.τ.λ.**—**εἰς ὃν ἠλπίκαμεν**: *towards whom we have set our hope.* **εἰς** with the acc. (see reff.) expresses the direction *towards* which hope looks; **ἐπί** with the dat. after **ἐλπίζειν** (1 Tim. iv. 10, vi. 17) rather indicates that *in* which hope rests. *Cf.* Ps. iv. 6, **ἐλπίσατε ἐπὶ κύριον.** The perfect **ἠλπίκαμεν** here has its full force, *viz.*, "towards whom we have set our hope, and continue to do so"; *cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 19, 1 Tim. v. 5, vi. 17.—**καὶ ἔτι ῥύσεται**: the force of **ἔτι** (if indeed it be part of the true text: see crit. note) is to carry the mind on to the perils of the future, as distinguished from those of the present: *He will continue to deliver us.*

Ver. 11. **συνυπουργούντων καὶ ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ.**: *ye also helping together on our behalf by your supplication; i.e.*, apparently, "helping *me*". St. Paul claims that the sympathy of his converts with him shall be exhibited by their prayers for him. **δέησις** is prayer for a particular object, as contrasted with the more general **προσευχή** (Eph. vi. 18).—**ἵνα ἐκ πολλῶν προσώπων κ.τ.λ.**: *that from many faces* (*sc.*, as if upturned in thanksgiving) *thanks be given on our behalf through many for the gift bestowed on us.* **πρόσωπον** came to mean "person" in later Greek, but it never can be thus translated in the N.T., save in the phrase **λαμβάνειν πρόσωπον** (Luke xx. 21, Gal. ii. 6) or **θαυμάζειν πρόσωπα** (Jude 16), "to respect the person" of anyone. Even in these passages **λαμβάνειν πρόσωπον** is a Hebraism which originally meant "raise the face" (see Plummer on Luke xx. 21). **πρόσωπον** is used ten times elsewhere in this Epistle in its ordinary sense of "face" (chap. ii. 10, iii. 7, 13, 18, iv. 6, v. 12, viii. 24, x. 1, 7, xi. 20; *cf.* also 1 Cor. xiii. 12, xiv. 25, Gal. i. 22). Hence we cannot follow the English versions in translating **ἐκ**

g 1 Cor. xiii. 12, xiv. 37, xvi. 18; chaps. vi. 9, xiii. 5.

τέρως δὲ πρὸς ὑμᾶς. 13. οὐ γὰρ ἄλλα γράφομεν ὑμῖν ἀλλ'[1] ἢ[2] ἃ ἀναγινώσκετε, ἢ[3] καὶ [g] ἐπιγινώσκετε, ἐλπίζω δὲ ὅτι καὶ[4] ἕως τέλους

[1] BG om. **αλλ'**. [2] A om. **η α**.

[3] B and a few cursives omit **η και επιγνωσκετε** (through homœoteleuton); GK, the Latin, Peshitto and Bohairic vss. omit **η**.

[4] ℵABCD*EG and most vss. omit **και**; ins. DᶜKLMP and the Harclean.

πολλῶν προσώπων "by many persons" in this verse, an additional difficulty in the way of such a rendering being that it would require **ὑπό**, not **ἐκ**. **πρόσωπον** is a *face*, and the image in the writer's mind is that of faces upturned in prayer, the early Christian (and the Jewish) attitude of prayer being one of standing with uplifted eyes and outstretched arms (*cf.* Ps. xxvii. 2, Matt. vi. 5, 1 Tim. ii. 8, and Clem. Rom., § 29). The general thought, of the united thanksgivings of many persons, is found twice again in the Epistle in somewhat similar contexts (see reff.). **χάρισμα** and **εὐχαριστεῖν** (the passive is found here only in N.T.) are favourite words with St. Paul, the former occurring sixteen times in his Epistles and only once elsewhere in the N.T. (1 Pet. iv. 10).

Vv. 12-14. THEY MUST ACKNOWLEDGE HIS SINCERITY OF PURPOSE. He claims that he has always been frank and open in his dealings with the Corinthian Christians: *cf.* 1 Thess. ii. 3.—**ἡ γὰρ καύχησις κ.τ.λ.**: *for our glorying is this.* Note **καύχησις**, not **καύχημα**, as at ver. 14, which is rather the thing boasted of than the act of boasting. **καυχάομαι** and its cognates are peculiarly frequent in this Epistle (see *Introd.*, p. 27).—**τὸ μαρτύριον τῆς συνειδήσεως ἡμῶν**: *viz., the testimony of our conscience.* **μαρτύριον** is the thing testified to by conscience, as contrasted with **μαρτυρία**, the act of testimony. **συνείδησις**, "conscientia," represents the self sitting in judgment on self, a specially Greek idea, and taken over by St. Paul from Greek thought; the word is a favourite one with him, both in his Epistles and in his speeches (Acts xxiii. 1, xxiv. 16).—**ὅτι ἐν ἁγιότητι καὶ εἰλικρινείᾳ Θεοῦ**: *that in holiness and sincerity of God* (*cf.* chap. iv. 2). The received reading, **ἁπλότητι**, probably arose from the fact that while **ἁπλότης** occurs four times in this Epistle, and is a specially Pauline word, **ἁγιότης** is rare, only occurring in the Greek Bible twice elsewhere (2 Macc. xv. 2, Heb. xii. 10). The etymology of **εἰλικρινεία** (see reff.) is uncertain; but the meaning is not doubtful. The force of the genitive **τοῦ Θεοῦ** is somewhat the same as in the phrase **δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ** (Rom. iii. 21); the *holiness* and *sincerity* which St. Paul claims as characterising his conduct are Divine qualities, and in so far as they are displayed in men they are God's gift, as he goes on to explain.—**οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ σαρκικῇ κ.τ.λ.**: *not in fleshly wisdom, but in God's grace, sc.*, which had been vouchsafed to him for the due discharge of his apostolic office (Rom. i. 5, xii. 3, xv. 15, 1 Cor. iii. 10, Eph. iii. 2). Especially in the Corinthian letters does St. Paul insist on this, that his power is not that of human wisdom (1 Cor. ii. 4, 13, chap. x. 4). The word **σαρκικός** is found five times in his letters, and only twice elsewhere in N.T. It signifies that which belongs to the nature of the **σάρξ** of man, as contrasted with **σάρκινος**, "made of flesh," which is the stronger word (*cf.* iii. 3 below).—**ἀνεστράφημεν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ**: *did we behave ourselves in the world, sc.*, the heathen world (*cf.* 1 Cor. v. 10, Phil. ii. 15).—**περισσοτέρως δὲ πρὸς ὑμᾶς**: *and more abundantly to you-ward, sc.*, perhaps because his opportunities at Corinth had been greater than elsewhere of displaying the holiness and sincerity of the Christian life.

Ver. 13. **οὐ γὰρ ἄλλα κ.τ.λ.**: *for we write none other things unto you than what ye read* (**ἀναγινώσκειν** always means "to read" in St. Paul's Epp. and throughout the N.T.) *or even acknowledge; i.e.*, there is no hidden meaning in his letters; he means what he says, as to which doubts seem to have been prevalent at Corinth (chap. x. 10, 11). The play upon words **ἀναγινώσκετε . . . ἐπιγινώσκετε** cannot be reproduced in English. St. Paul is fond of such paronomasia; see, *e.g.*, **γινωσκομένη . . . ἀναγινωσκομένη**, chap. iii. 2; **φρονεῖν, ὑπερφρονεῖν, σωφρονεῖν**, Rom. xii. 3; **συνκρίνω, ἀνακρίνω**, 1 Cor. ii. 13, 14; **ἐργαζόμενοι . . . περιεργαζόμενοι**, 2 Thess. iii. 11; *cf.* for other illustrations 1 Cor. vii. 31, xi. 31, xii. 2, Phil. iii. 2, Eph. v. 15, and chaps

ἐπιγνώσεσθε, 14. καθὼς καὶ ἐπέγνωτε ἡμᾶς [h] ἀπὸ [h] μέρους, ὅτι [i] καύχημα ὑμῶν ἐσμεν, καθάπερ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἡμῶν, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου [1] Ἰησοῦ.[2] 15. καὶ ταύτῃ τῇ [k] πεποιθήσει ἐβουλόμην πρὸς [3] ὑμᾶς ἐλθεῖν πρότερον,[4] ἵνα δευτέραν χάριν [5] ἔχητε,[6] 16. καὶ [l] δι' ὑμῶν διελθεῖν [7] εἰς Μακεδονίαν, καὶ πάλιν ἀπὸ Μακεδονίας ἐλθεῖν

[h] Jos. xviii. 20; Rom. xi. 25, xv. 15, 24; chap. ii. 5 only.
[i] Chaps. v. 12, ix. 3.
[k] Chaps. iii. 4, viii. 22, x. 2; Eph. iii. 12; Phil. iii. 4 only.
[l] Num. xx. 18; Rom. xv. 28.

[1] **του κυριου ημων** is read by ℵBGMP, f, g, vg., the Bohairic and Peshitto. **ημων** is (wrongly) omitted by ACDEKL, d, e and most cursives.

[2] D*EGMP and nearly all vss. add **Χριστου** after **Ἰησου**; om. ℵ*ABCDᵇᶜKL (rightly).

[3] DEGKL and most vss. have **ελθειν προς υμας**; but ℵABCMP and the Harclean support the received order.

[4] **προτερον** should come after **εβουλομην**, with nearly all the uncials; the received text follows the order of KL and the Bohairic.

[5] We retain **χαριν**, which is found in ℵ*ACDEGK; but ℵᶜBLP have **χαραν**, which is adopted by W.H., and is mentioned in R.V. margin.

[6] **εχητε** ADEGKL; better **σχητε** with ℵBCP (see on ii. 3).

[7] AD*GP have **απελθειν**; **διελθειν** ℵBCDᶜEKL.

iv. 8, x. 12 below. **ἀλλ' ἤ** is equivalent to "except"; *cf.* Job vi. 5, Isa. xlii. 19. —**ἐλπίζω δὲ ὅτι κ.τ.λ.**: *and I hope that ye will acknowledge unto the end, sc.*, unto the day of the Lord's appearing (as in 1 Cor. i. 8), when the secrets of all hearts shall be revealed.

Ver. 14. **καθὼς καὶ ἐπέγνωτε κ.τ.λ.**: *as also ye did acknowledge us in part; i.e., some* of them made this acknowledgment, but not all (1 Cor. iii. 4).—**ὅτι καύχημα ὑμῶν ἐσμεν**: *that* (not "because") *we are your glorying* (*cf.* v. 12); that is, the Corinthian Church was proud of its connexion with the great Apostle, and still "gloried" in him.—**καθάπερ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ.**: *as ye also are ours, in the day of our Lord Jesus.* Lest this assertion of his single-mindedness and integrity should seem to claim any undue superiority to his fellow Christians at Corinth, he hastens to add, parenthetically, with remarkable tact, that if he is their "glory" so are they his. He constantly thinks thus of his converts; *cf.*, *e.g.*, Phil. ii. 16 and 1 Thess. ii. 19, 20.—**ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ**: "A day of the Lord," "The Day of the Lord" are common expressions in the prophets; *cf.* Isa. xiii. 6, 9, Jer. xlvi. 10, Ezek. xxx. 3, Zech. xiv. 1, Joel i. 15, ii. 1, 11, 31 (cited Acts ii. 20), etc. And the phrase is taken up by St. Paul (1 Thess. v. 2, 1 Cor. i. 8, v. 5; *cf.* Phil. i. 10, 2 Tim. i. 12), and is applied to the Second Advent of Christ; *cf.* also 2 Pet. iii. 10, and Matt. xxiv. 42.

Vv. 15-22. His Change of Plan was not Due to Fickleness. **καὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πεποιθήσει ἐβουλόμην κ.τ.λ.**: *and in this confidence* (*sc.*, that they would acknowledge his sincerity) *I was minded to come before* (*sc.*, before he went to Macedonia) *unto you, that ye might have a second benefit.* The circumstances seem to have been as follows. While St. Paul was at Ephesus (Acts xix.) his intention had been to cross the Ægean to Corinth, thence to visit Macedonia, and then to come back to Corinth on his way to Judæa with the contributions which he had gathered (*cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 3, 4). The Corinthians would thus have enjoyed a "second benefit" (*cf.* Rom. i. 11, xv. 29), inasmuch as he would have visited them both on his way to Macedonia, and on his return journey. This project he had communicated to them, probably in the letter which is lost (1 Cor. v. 9). But he received bad news from Corinth (1 Cor. i. 11), and he wrote 1 *Cor.* in reply. In this letter (1 Cor. xvi. 5) he incidentally mentioned that he had changed his plans, and that he now proposed to travel from Ephesus to Corinth *viâ* Macedonia, the route which he adopted in the sequel (Acts xx. 1 ff., chap. ii. 12, vii. 5). When the Corinthians heard of this, they began to reproach him with fickleness of purpose (chap. i. 17), and the charge came to his ears. We have his defence in the verses (15-22) before us.

Ver. 16. **προπεμφθῆναι**: "to be set forward on my journey". The practice

πρὸς ὑμᾶς, καὶ ὑφ' ὑμῶν [m] προπεμφθῆναι εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν. 17. τοῦτο οὖν βουλευόμενος[1] μή τι ἄρα τῇ [n] ἐλαφρίᾳ ἐχρησάμην; ἢ ἃ [o] βουλεύομαι, [p] κατὰ [p] σάρκα βουλεύομαι, ἵνα ᾖ παρ' ἐμοὶ τὸ [q] ναὶ ναὶ καὶ τὸ οὒ οὔ; 18. πιστὸς δὲ ὁ Θεός, ὅτι ὁ λόγος ἡμῶν ὁ πρὸς ὑμᾶς οὐκ ἐγένετο[2] ναὶ καὶ οὔ· 19. ὁ γὰρ[3] τοῦ Θεοῦ υἱὸς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς[4] ὁ ἐν ὑμῖν δι' ἡμῶν [r] κηρυχθεὶς, δι' ἐμοῦ καὶ Σιλουανοῦ καὶ

m Acts xv. 3, xx. 38, xxi. 5; Rom. xv. 24; 1 Cor. xvi. 6, 11; Tit. iii. 13.
n Here only; *cf.* chap. iv. 17.
o Here only in Paul.
p John viii. 15; Rom. viii. 4, 12, 13; chaps. v. 16, x. 2, xi. 18.
q Mt. v. 37; Jas. v. 12.
r 1 Tim. iii. 16.

[1] The better reading is **βουλομενος**, with ℵABCGP, f, vg. and the Bohairic; **βουλευομενος** DEK, d, e, g and the Syriac.

[2] **εγενετο** of ℵ[c]D[bc]EKL is probably a (mistaken) correction of **εστιν**, which is read by ℵ*ABCD*GP 17, the Latin and the Bohairic vss.

[3] ℵABCP, 17 have **ο του Θεου γαρ**; text follows the later authorities DEGKL.

[4] **Ἰη. Χρ.** has the support of ℵ[c]BDEGKLP; but ℵ*AC (a strong combination) give **Χρ. Ἰη.** The order of words is therefore doubtful, but we prefer **Χρ. Ἰη.** on the whole.

of speeding fellow-Christians on their journeys, of "seeing them off" in safety, is often mentioned in *Acts*, and is inculcated more than once as a duty by St. Paul (see reff.).

Ver. 17. **τοῦτο οὖν βουλόμενος κ.τ.λ.**: *when therefore I was thus minded, did I shew fickleness?* The article **τῇ** before **ἐλαφρίᾳ** can hardly be pressed so as to convey the meaning "*that* fickleness which you lay to my charge"; it is merely generic.—**ἢ ἃ βουλεύομαι κ.τ.λ.**: *or the things that I purpose, do I purpose according to the flesh, that there should be with me the Yea, yea, and the Nay, nay?* That is, "Are my plans made like those of a worldly man, that they may be changed according to my own caprice, *Yes* to-day, *No* to-morrow?" His argument is that, although the details of his original plan had been altered, yet in spirit and purpose it was unchanged; there is no room for any charge of inconsistency or fickleness. His principles of action are unchangeable, as is the Gospel which he preaches. He had promised to go to Corinth, and he would go. For a similar use of the phrase **κατὰ σάρκα** see reff., and *cf.* chap. v. 16. The reduplication **ναὶ ναὶ . . . οὔ οὔ** is not altogether easy to explain; but we have **ναὶ ναὶ** repeated similarly in Matt. v. 37, and perhaps we may also compare the **Ἀμὴν, Ἀμήν** of St. John's Gospel (*e.g.*, x. 1). Some critics (*e.g.*, Steck) have regarded **ναὶ ναὶ . . . οὔ οὔ** here as an actual quotation from Matt. v. 37. But apart from the fact that this opinion rests on a quite untenable theory as to the date of this Epistle (see *Introd.*, p. 12), the context of the words will not lend itself to any such interpretation (see above).

Ver. 18. **πιστὸς δὲ ὁ Θεὸς ὅτι κ.τ.λ.**: *but as God is faithful, our word, etc.* For the construction, *cf.* the similar forms of asseveration **ζῇ κύριος ὅτι**, "as the Lord liveth" (1 Sam. xx. 3, 2 Sam. ii. 27), and **ἔστιν ἀλήθεια Χριστοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ ὅτι**, "as the truth of Christ is in me" (xi. 10). For **πιστός** as applied to God, see Deut. vii. 9, 1 Cor. i. 9, x. 13, 1 Thess. v. 24, 2 Thess. iii. 3, 2 Tim. ii. 13, and *cf.* 1 Sam. xv. 29.—**ὁ λόγος ἡμῶν ὁ πρὸς ὑμᾶς οὐκ ἔστιν Ναὶ καὶ Οὔ**: *our word* (*sc.*, my personal communications about my journey, as well as the message of the Gospel) *towards you is not Yea and Nay.* I do not deceive you or vacillate in my purpose: *cf.* ii. 17.

Ver. 19. He has appealed to the faithfulness of God, and this suggests the thought of the unchangeableness of Christ.—**ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ γὰρ υἱὸς κ.τ.λ.**: *for the Son of God, Christ Jesus, who was proclaimed among you by us.* The position of **τοῦ Θεοῦ** before **γάρ** (as in the true text) brings out the sequence of thought better, as it brings **Θεοῦ** (the connecting word) into prominence.—**δι' ἐμοῦ καὶ Σιλουανοῦ καὶ Τιμοθέου**: *even by me and Silvanus and Timothy.* These three brought the Gospel to Corinth (Acts xviii. 5), and were closely associated during the Apostle's labours in that city (1 Thess. i. 1, 2 Thess. i. 1). *Silvanus* is only another form of the name *Silas;* he was a prophet (Acts xv. 32), and apparently, like St. Paul, a Roman citizen (Acts xvi. 37), and shared the

Τιμοθέου, οὐκ ἐγένετο ναὶ καὶ οὔ, ἀλλὰ ναὶ ἐν αὐτῷ γέγονεν· 20. [s] ὅσαι γὰρ [s] ἐπαγγελίαι [s] Θεοῦ, ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ ναί, καὶ [1] ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ ἀμήν, τῷ Θεῷ πρὸς δόξαν δι' ἡμῶν. 21. ὁ δὲ [t] βεβαιῶν ἡμᾶς [2] σὺν ὑμῖν εἰς Χριστόν, καὶ [u] χρίσας ἡμᾶς, Θεός· 22. ὁ [3] καὶ [v] σφραγισάμενος ἡμᾶς, καὶ δοὺς τὸν [w] ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν.

[s] Rom. iv. 20; Gal. iii. 21. [t] Rom. xv. 8; 1 Cor. i. 6, 8; Col. ii. 7; *cf.* Phil. i. 7. [u] Acts iv. 27, x. 38; Heb. i. 9. Eph. i. 14. [v] John vi. 27; Eph. i. 13, iv. 30; Rev. vii. 3, 4. [w] Gen. xxxviii. 17; chap. v. 5;

[1] **και εν αυτω** DbcEKL and the Harclean; **διο και δι' αυτου** has the stronger support of ℵABCGP 17, the Peshitto and the Bohairic.

[2] C and the Harclean stand almost alone in reading **υμας συν ημιν**; B has **υμας συν υμιν** and **υμας** at the end of the verse.

[3] ℵcBCcDELO have **ο και σφρ.**; G and the Latins have **και ο σφρ.**; while ℵ*AC*KP 17 and the Bohairic omit **ο** altogether. Tisch. retains it before **και**, but W.H. enclose it in brackets.

Apostle's perils during the whole of his second missionary journey (Acts xv. 40—xviii. 18). We hear of him again at Rome (1 Pet. v. 12).—**οὐκ ἐγένετο ναὶ καὶ οὔ, ἀλλὰ ναὶ ἐν αὐτῷ γέγονεν**: *was not Yea and Nay, but in Him is* (*sc.*, has been and continues to be) *Yea*. There is no doubtfulness or vacillation in the words of Christ (Matt. vii. 29, John xii. 50); and He continually emphasised the positive and certain character of His teaching by the introductory formula **Ἀμὴν, ἀμήν**. More than this, however, is involved here. Christ, who is the Object and Sum of St. Paul's preaching, is unchangeable (Heb. xiii. 8), for He is not only "true" (Rev. iii. 7), but "the Truth" (John xiv. 6): He is, in brief, **ὁ Ἀμήν** (Rev. iii. 14), and so it may be said that an Eternal "Yea" has come into being (**γέγονεν**, through His incarnate Life) in Him.

Ver. 20. **ὅσαι γὰρ ἐπαγγελίαι κ.τ.λ.**: *for how many soever be the promises of God, in Him is the Yea*. Not only was Christ a **διάκονος περιτομῆς . . . εἰς τὸ βεβαιῶσαι τὰς ἐπαγγελίας τῶν πατέρων** (Rom. xv. 8), but He is Himself, in His own Person, the true fulfilment and recapitulation of them all (*cf.* Gal. iii. 8).—**διὸ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ τὸ Ἀμήν κ.τ.λ.**: *wherefore also through Him is the "Amen," to the glory of God, through us*. The reading of the received text conceals the force of these words. It is because Christ is the consummation, the "Yea" of the Divine promises, that the "Amen" is specially fitting at the close of doxologies in public worship (1 Cor. xiv. 16). The thought of the fulfilment of God's promises naturally leads to a doxology (Rom. xv. 9), to which a solemn **Ἀμήν**, the Hebrew form of the Greek **ναί**, whose significance as applied to Christ has just been expounded, is a fitting climax. **δι' ἡμῶν** in this clause includes, of course, both St. Paul and his correspondents; it refers, indeed, to the general practice of Christians in their public devotions.

Ver. 21. **ὁ δὲ βεβαιῶν κ.τ.λ.**: *now He that stablisheth us with you into Christ and anointed us is God*, etc. For the form of the sentence *cf.* chap. v. 5. The ultimate ground of St. Paul's steadfastness in Christ is God Himself; and having been led on to say this, he adds **σὺν ὑμῖν**, in order to introduce (as he does at every opportunity in the early part of the Epistle) the idea of unity between him and his Corinthian converts. The play on words **Χριστόν . . . χρίσας** is obvious; the only other place in the N.T. where the idea is found of the "anointing" of the Christian believer by God is 1 John ii. 20, 27, **ὑμεῖς χρίσμα ἔχετε ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου**. Deissmann has pointed out (*Bibelstudien*, p. 104) that **βεβαιόω** and **ἀρραβών** (see note below) are both technical terms belonging to the law courts (*cf.* Lev. xxv. 23, LXX), and that **βεβαιῶν** is here deliberately used rather than **κυριῶν** (Gal. iii. 15), or any other such word.

Ver. 22. **ὁ καὶ σφρ. ἡμᾶς κ.τ.λ.**: *who also sealed us* (*sc.*, all Christians), *and gave us the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts*. The aorists, **σφραγισάμενος . . . δούς**, point to acts completed at a definite moment in the past; and this can only mean the moment of *baptism*. This, too, is the best explanation of the parallel passages, Eph. i. 13, iv. 30. The gift of the Holy Spirit is repeatedly mentioned as consequent on baptism (Acts ii. 38, xix. 6); and the **σφραγίς**, or "seal" of baptism, is a common image in early Christian literature (*e.g.*, [2 Clem.,] § 8,

23. ἐγὼ δὲ μάρτυρα τὸν Θεὸν ἐπικαλοῦμαι ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχήν, ὅτι [x] φειδόμενος ὑμῶν οὐκέτι [1] ἦλθον εἰς Κόρινθον· 24. [y] οὐχ ὅτι [z] κυριεύομεν ὑμῶν [2] τῆς πίστεως, ἀλλὰ συνεργοί ἐσμεν τῆς χαρᾶς ὑμῶν,

x 1 Cor. vii. 28; chaps. xii. 6, xiii. 2.
y Chap. iii. 5; Phil. iii. 12, iv. 17; 2 Thess. iii. 9.
z Rom. vi. 9, 14, vii. 1, xiv. 9; 1 Tim. vi. 15.

[1] G has **ουκ**, which also seems to have been read by the Peshitto, Bohairic and d, e, g of the Latins.

[2] DEG and the Latins give the order **της πιστεως υμων**.

τηρήσατε . . . τὴν σφραγῖδα ἄσπιλον). The "seal" of the Church is given by St. Paul (2 Tim. ii. 19) as "The Lord knoweth them that are His" (Num. xvi. 5), and "Let every one that nameth the Name of the Lord depart from unrighteousness" (Isa. lii. 11; *cf.* Num. xvi. 26, Isa. xxvi. 13). The **ἀρραβών** (see an exhaustive note in Pearson, *On the Creed*, viii.), *i.e.*, עֵרָבוֹן, is a first instalment, given in pledge of full payment in due course; see reff. and *cf.* Rom. viii. 16, **τὸ πνεῦμα συνμαρτυρεῖ τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν ὅτι ἐσμὲν τέκνα Θεοῦ**: here is the **ἀπαρχὴ τοῦ πνεύματος** (Rom. viii. 23). For the constr. **διδόναι ἐν** *cf.* Ezek. xxxvi. 26, John iii. 35, Acts iv. 12, chap. viii. 1, 16.

Ver. 23—ii. 4. THE REAL REASON OF THE POSTPONEMENT OF HIS VISIT TO CORINTH WAS THAT HE DID NOT WISH HIS NEXT VISIT TO BE PAINFUL, AS THE LAST HAD BEEN.—Ver. 23. **ἐγὼ δὲ μάρτυρα τὸν Θεὸν ἐπικ. κ.τ.λ.**: *but* (*sc.*, whatever my opponents may say) *I invoke God as a witness against my soul, sc.*, if I speak falsely; *cf.* Rom. i. 9, Gal. i. 20, Phil. i. 8, 1 Thess. ii. 5, 10. For **ἐπί** used in this way *cf.* **εἰς μαρτύριον ἐπ' αὐτούς** (Luke ix. 5). The A.V. and R.V. "*upon* my soul" do not bring out the sense clearly. — **ὅτι φειδόμενος ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ.**: *that to spare you I came not again to Corinth, i.e.*, "I paid no fresh visit," "I gave up the thought of coming". The A.V., "I came not *as yet*," is here quite misleading (*cf.* xiii. 2 and 1 Cor. iv. 21).

Ver. 24. This verse is parenthetical, and introduced to guard against misunderstanding. **οὐχ ὅτι κυριεύομεν ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως**: *not that we have lordship over your faith.* This is not the department of his Apostolic authority (*cf.* Luke xxii. 25, 1 Pet. v. 3).—**ἀλλὰ συνεργοί κ.τ.λ.**: *but we are* (only) *fellow-workers in* (producing) *your joy;* a parenthesis within a parenthesis, not necessary to the sense, but added to emphasise once more his sense of the common ties between him and the Corinthians (*cf.* Rom. xvi. 3, chap. viii. 23, Col. iv. 11).—**τῇ γὰρ πίστει ἑστήκατε**: *for by your faith ye stand.* If it were dominated by the authority of another, it would not be thus the instrument of their steadfastness. Another (inferior) interpretation is, "As regards your faith ye stand," *i.e.*, "I have no fault to find with you so far as your faith is concerned"; but the parallel, Rom. xi. 20, seems to fix the dative as instrumental.

CHAPTER II.—Ver. 1. **ἔκρινα δὲ ἐμαυτῷ τοῦτο κ.τ.λ.**: *but I decided this for my own sake, that I would not come again to you with sorrow; i.e.*, I determined that my next visit should not be painful, as my last was. The juxtaposition of **πάλιν** with **ἐν λύπῃ** (see crit. note) requires that interpretation. Hence the former visit in St. Paul's mind could not have been his *first* visit to Corinth (Acts xviii. 1 ff.), for that was not **ἐν λύπῃ**. And thus we are forced to conclude that another visit was paid from Ephesus, of which no details have been preserved (*cf.* xii. 14, xiii. 1). The conditions of the scanty evidence available seem best satisfied by supposing that St. Paul's second visit to Corinth was paid from Ephesus during the period Acts xix. 10. Alarming news had probably reached him, and he determined to make enquiries for himself. On his return to Ephesus he wrote the letter (now lost) alluded to in 1 Cor. v. 9, in which he charged the Corinthians "to keep no company with fornicators". Subsequently to this he *again* received distressing intelligence (1 Cor. i. 11, v. 1, etc.), whereupon he wrote the first canonical Epistle (see *Introd.*, p. 7).

Ver. 2. **εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ κ.τ.λ.**: *for if I make you sorry, who then is he that makes me glad, but he who is made sorry by me?* His argument is: When I make you sorry, it is that you may repent (see chap. vii. 9), and so gladden me: my change of purpose was not prompted by the desire of giving pain, but on the con-

[a] τῇ γὰρ [a] πίστει [a] ἑστήκατε· II. 1. [a] ἔκρινα δὲ[1] ἐμαυτῷ τοῦτο, [a] τὸ μὴ πάλιν ἐλθεῖν[2] ἐν λύπῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς. 2. εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ λυπῶ ὑμᾶς, καὶ τίς ἐστιν[3] ὁ [b] εὐφραίνων με, εἰ μὴ ὁ λυπούμενος ἐξ ἐμοῦ; 3. καὶ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν[4] [c] τοῦτο[5] [c] αὐτό, ἵνα μὴ ἐλθὼν λύπην[6] ἔχω[7] ἀφ' [b] ὧν ἔδει με χαίρειν· [d] πεποιθὼς [d] ἐπὶ πάντας ὑμᾶς, ὅτι ἡ ἐμὴ χαρὰ πάντων ὑμῶν ἐστιν. 4. ἐκ γὰρ πολλῆς [e] θλίψεως καὶ [f] συνοχῆς καρδίας ἔγραψα ὑμῖν διὰ πολλῶν δακρύων, οὐχ ἵνα λυπηθῆτε, ἀλλὰ τὴν[8] ἀγάπην ἵνα γνῶτε ἣν ἔχω περισσοτέρως εἰς[9] ὑμᾶς.

5. Εἰ δέ τις λελύπηκεν, οὐκ ἐμὲ λελύπηκεν, ἀλλ' [g] ἀπὸ [g] μέρους,

a Rom. xi. 20; *cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 13.
a Rom. xiv. 13.
b Rom. xv. 10; Gal. iv. 27.
c Rom. xiii. 6; chap. vii. 11.
d 2 Thess. iii. 4.
e Reff. i. 4.
f Job xxx. 3; Lk. xxi. 25.
g Reff. i. 14.

[1] B 17, the Bohairic and Harclean have **γαρ**; D* has **τε**; all other authorities **δε**.

[2] ℵABCKLOP place **ελθειν** after **υμας**; DEG and the Peshitto read **ελθειν προς υμας**, and the Bohairic has **το μη ελθειν προς υμας εν λυπη** (omitting **παλιν**). The received order is found in a few cursives only.

[3] ℵcDEGKLOP, etc., give **εστιν**; om. ℵ*ABC and the Bohairic.

[4] ℵcCcDEGKL, the Syriac and (most) Latin vss. have **υμιν**, which is omitted by ℵ*ABC*OP 17 and the Bohairic.

[5] CO give **αυτο τουτο** (*cf.* vii. 11); A and the Bohairic omit **αυτο**.

[6] DEG and a few other authorities have **λυπην επι λυπην** (from a reminiscence of Phil. ii. 27).

[7] **εχω** ℵcDEGKL; better **σχω**, ℵ*ABOP (see on i. 15).

[8] G has **ινα γνωτε την αγαπην**. [9] G has **προς υμας**.

trary by my fear that, if I visited you as I had intended, you would sadden me: I should have had to grieve, and be grieved by those who are the source of my purest joy. With the introductory **καὶ τίς,** "Who then," the implied answer being "No one," *cf.* Mark x. 26, **καὶ τίς δύναται σωθῆναι,** and chap. ii. 16.

Ver. 3. **καὶ ἔγραψα τοῦτο αὐτό**: *and I wrote this very thing; i.e.*, I communicated my change of plan (1 Cor. xvi. 5 ff.). So **ἔκρινα τοῦτο** in ver. 1. (The translation "just for this reason," taking **τοῦτο αὐτό** adverbially, is also admissible; *cf.* 2 Pet. i. 5).—**ἵνα μὴ ἐλθὼν λύπην κ.τ.λ.**: *lest when I came I should have sorrow from them from whom I ought to rejoice.* **ἀφ' ὧν** is for **ἀπ ἐκείνων ἀφ' ὧν**; *cf.* 1 Pet. ii. 12, iii. 16.—**πεποιθὼς ἐπὶ πάντας ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ.**: *having confidence in you all, that my joy is the joy of you all; i.e.*, having confidence in the perfect sympathy between himself and his correspondents. He could only be made glad if they were made glad; and so to visit them for the purpose of rebuking them would be as painful to him as to them. Observe the repeated **πάντας . . . πάντων**: despite the factions in Corinth (1 Cor. iii. 4) *he* must think of them *all* as his friends (*cf.* xiii. 13).

Ver. 4. **ἐκ γὰρ πολλῆς θλίψεως κ.τ.λ.**: *for out of much affliction and anguish of heart I wrote to you with many tears.* This describes the state of mind in which he wrote 1 *Cor.*, if the view of the situation which has been adopted in this commentary be correct (see *Introd.*, p. 13).—**διὰ πολλῶν δακρύων**: we have **διά** used, somewhat similarly, with the genitive of the attendant circumstances, in Rom. ii. 27, iv. 11, viii. 25, xiv. 20, chap. v. 7, Heb. xii. 1, Rev. xxi. 24, etc.—**οὐχ ἵνα λυπηθῆτε κ.τ.λ.**: *not that ye should be made sorry, but that ye should know the love which I have so abundantly to you.* **ἀγάπη**, as a grace especially to be exhibited in Christian intercourse, is repeatedly dwelt on by St. Paul. The word has been described as "ecclesiastical" and as having been first introduced to literature in the LXX. But it has been recently found in papyri of the Ptolemaic period (Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 81), and it thus appears that the LXX only took over a word already current in the speech of Greek Egypt. Here the position of **ἀγάπην** *before* **ἵνα** gives it special emphasis; *cf.*, for a like order, Acts xix. 4, Rom. xi. 31. **περισσοτέρως** *may* mean "more abundantly," *sc.*, than to other Churches; but it is

h 1 Thess. ii. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 8 only. **ἵνα μὴ** h **ἐπιβαρῶ πάντας ὑμᾶς.** 6. i **ἱκανὸν τῷ** k **τοιούτῳ ἡ** l **ἐπιτιμία**
αὕτη ἡ ὑπὸ m **τῶν** m **πλειόνων·** 7. **ὥστε** n **τοὐναντίον μᾶλλον** l **ὑμᾶς**
i 1 Cor. xv. 9; chaps. ii. 16, iii. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 2. **χαρίσασθαι καὶ παρακαλέσαι, μήπως τῇ περισσοτέρᾳ λύπῃ** p **κατα-**
ποθῇ ὁ τοιοῦτος. 8. **διὸ παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς** q **κυρῶσαι εἰς αὐτὸν ἀγάπην.**
9. **εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ ἔγραψα,**[2] **ἵνα γνῶ τὴν** r **δοκιμὴν ὑμῶν,**[3] **εἰ** [4] **εἰς**
k 1 Cor. v. 5; chaps. x. 11, xi. 13. l Wisd. iii. 10 only; *cf.* 2 Macc. vi. 13. m 1 Cor. ix. 19, x. 5, xv. 6; chaps. iv. 15, ix. 2; Phil. i. 14. n Gal. ii. 7; 1 Pet. iii. 9 only; 3 Macc. iii. 22. o Chaps. ii. 10, xii. 13; Eph. iv. 32; Col. ii. 13, iii. 13; Lk. vii. 42. p 1 Cor. xv. 54 (Isa. xxv. 8); chap. v. 4. q Gal. iii. 15; Gen. xxiii. 20; Lev. xxv. 30. r Rom. v. 4; chaps. viii. 2, ix. 13, xiii. 3; Phil. ii. 22 only.

[1] AB and the Peshitto (which W.H. follow here) omit **μαλλον**, but it is found in all other authorities; DEG 17 place it after **υμας**.

[2] G inserts **υμων** (*vobis*, f, g, and so the Bohairic) after **εγραψα**.

[3] G, g prefix **παντων** to **υμων**.

[4] AB 17 have **η**, which W.H. place in their margin; almost all other authorities have **ει**.

quite legitimate to take it as used without any special comparative force (*cf.* x. 8).

Vv. 5-11. THE OFFENDER HAS BEEN SUFFICIENTLY PUNISHED: THE APOSTLE ACQUIESCES IN THEIR REMISSION OF THE PENALTY OF 1 Cor. v. 1-5.—Ver. 5. **εἰ δέ τις λελύπηκεν κ.τ.λ.**: *but if any one, sc.*, the incestuous person of 1 Cor. v. 1, his name being suppressed with a rare delicacy of feeling, *hath caused sorrow, he hath caused sorrow, not to me, sc.*, I am not the person directly aggrieved, *but to some extent* (*that I press not too heavily on him*) *to you all.* That is to say to the words **ἀπὸ μέρους** are added by the Apostle **ἵνα μὴ ἐπιβαρῶ** (*sc.*, **αὐτόν**). The sentence has been otherwise construed "he hath not caused sorrow to me [alone], but [only] in part [having caused sorrow to you also]: [this I add] that I may not press heavily on you all," *sc.*, by representing myself as the only person aggrieved. But this would require **εἰ μή** instead of **ἀλλά**, and, further, does not suit the context so well as the rendering given above, which treats **ἵνα μὴ ἐπιβαρῶ** as parenthetic.

Ver. 6. **ἱκανὸν τῷ τοιούτῳ κ.τ.λ.**: *sufficient to such an one* (the word used in 1 Cor. v. 5 to indicate the offender) *is this punishment* (*which was inflicted*) *by the majority.* The directions given by the Apostle for dealing with the offender had probably been carried out with harshness and severity; he now suggests that the punishment might be remitted, and the guilty man forgiven. **ἐπιτιμία** in the Attic orators is used for "the possession of political rights," but it came to mean (see reff.) *penalty* or *requital;* the punishment (see 1 Cor. v. 5) would seem to have been of a *disciplinary*, and not merely *punitive*, character; it was probably like the formal excommunication of a later age (*cf.* also 1 Tim. i. 20), and involved the exclusion of the guilty person from the privileges of the Christian Society. That it was inflicted only by "the majority" (for so we must translate **τῶν πλειόνων**; see reff.) is sufficiently accounted for by remembering the presence of an anti-Pauline party at Corinth, who would not be likely to follow the Apostle's instructions. The construction **ἱκανὸν . . . ἡ ἐπιτιμία** (**ἐστι**, rather than **ἔστω**, is the verb to be supplied) affords an instance of a neuter adjectival predicate set over against a feminine subject (*cf.* Matt. vi. 34); **ἱκανὸν** seems to be used here like the Latin *satis*.

Ver. 7. **ὥστε τοὐναντίον μᾶλλον κ.τ.λ.**: *so that contrariwise ye should rather forgive him and comfort him* (*cf.*, for the sentiment, Ecclus. viii. 5, Col. iii. 13, Eph. iv. 32). We should expect some verb like **δεῖν**, but it is perhaps sufficiently suggested by **ὥστε**. **χαρίζεσθαι** is generally found in the N.T. in the sense of "to bestow a favour"; but it conveys the special meaning "to forgive" in the passages referred to above.—**μήπως τῇ περισσοτέρᾳ λύπῃ κ.τ.λ.**: *lest such an one should be swallowed up with his excessive sorrow, sc.*, should be driven to despair through overmuch severity. Again (see on ver. 4 above) we are not to press the comparative force of **περισσοτέρᾳ**.

Ver. 8. **διὸ παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ.**: *wherefore I beseech you* (or "exhort you," see on i. 4) *to confirm your love toward him.* Authority "to bind" and "to loose" had been committed to the Apostles (Matt. xviii. 18); St. Paul had exercised the former function (1 Cor. v. 5), and he now discharges the latter. The various meanings of **παρακαλεῖν**

πάντα [s] ὑπήκοοί ἐστε. 10. ᾧ δέ τι [t] χαρίζεσθε, καὶ ἐγώ· καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ εἴ[1] τι κεχάρισμαι, ᾧ κεχάρισμαι, δι' ὑμᾶς, ἐν [u] προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ, 11. ἵνα μὴ [v] πλεονεκτηθῶμεν ὑπὸ τοῦ [w] Σατανᾶ· οὐ γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὰ [x] νοήματα ἀγνοοῦμεν.

12. Ἐλθὼν δὲ εἰς τὴν Τρωάδα εἰς[2] τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ

s Acts vii. 39; Phil. ii. 8 only.
t Reff. ii. 7.
u Reff. i. 11.
v Chaps. vii. 2, xii. 17, 18; 1 Thess. iv. 6 only.
w Rom. xvi. 20; 1 Cor. v. 5, vii. 5; chaps. xi. 14, xii. 7; 1 Thess. ii. 18; 2 Thess. ii. 9; 1 Tim. i. 20, v. 15.
x Chaps. iii. 14, iv. 4, x. 5, xi. 3; Phil. iv. 7 only; Bar. ii. 8; 3 Macc. v. 30.

[1] The better reading is **και γαρ εγω ο κεχαρ. ει τι κεχαρ.**, with ℵABCGO, etc.; received text D^bKL 17, the Harclean, etc.

[2] G and the Latin vss. have **δια το ευαγγελιον**; DE **δια του εναγγελιου.**

have been noted above (on i. 4); it is interesting to observe here how the word is used in one sense in ver. 7, and in another in close sequence in ver. 8 (*cf.* the two senses of **παραδίδωμι** in 1 Cor. xi. 23). For **ἀγάπη** see on ver. 4 above.

Ver. 9. **εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**: *for to this end also did I write, viz., that I might know the proof of you, whether ye were obedient in all things; i.e.*, his object in writing the former letter (1 *Cor.*) was not only the reformation of the offender, but the testing of the Corinthians' acceptance of his apostolic authority (*cf.* vii. 12). For the constr. **εἰς τοῦτο γάρ . . . ἵνα . . .** *cf.* Rom. xiv. 9. It is hard to decide between the readings **εἰ**, "whether," or **ᾗ**, "whereby" (see crit. note); but the general sense is the same in both cases. A comparison of this verse with vii. 12 has led some critics to doubt whether chaps. ii. and vii. really refer at all to the offender of 1 Cor. v. 1; for the expressed object of St. Paul's communication was to prove the loyalty of the Corinthians to himself. And thus it is supposed that the individual in view is some bitter personal opponent of St. Paul (see Tertullian, *de Pudic.* xiii. f.). But vv. 5-9 seem quite consecutive, and we find it more natural to interpret ver. 5 in reference to 1 Cor. v. 1 ff. And vii. 12 seems clearly to distinguish **ὁ ἀδικηθείς** from St. Paul himself (see *Introd.*, p. 15).

Ver. 10. **ᾧ δέ τι χαρίζεσθε κ.τ.λ.**: *but to whom ye forgive anything, I forgive also; for what I also have forgiven (if I have forgiven anything) for your sakes have I forgiven it in the face of Christ.* This is not a general principle, but a statement of the Apostle's feelings at the present juncture; if they are willing to forgive the offender, so is he. Whether he advocates punishment or forgiveness it is always **δι' ὑμᾶς**, "for your sakes," and it is **ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ**, "in the sight of Christ". **πρόσωπον** (see on i. 11) is a "face," and so **ἐν προσ. Χρ.** is a stronger way of saying **ἐνώπιον Χριστοῦ** (*cf.* chap. iv. 2, viii. 21, Gal. i. 20); the Apostle claims that his acts of condemnation and forgiveness are done as "in the presence of Christ". Both A.V. and R.V. render "in the person of Christ," which would mean that St. Paul had acted as Christ's delegate. But the usage of **πρόσωπον** in 2 *Cor.* is against this interpretation.

Ver. 11. **ἵνα μὴ πλεονεκτηθῶμεν κ.τ.λ.**: *lest we, sc.*, you and I together, *be robbed by Satan; i.e.*, lest we drive sinners to despair and so let Satan capture them from us. "The offender was to be delivered over **τῷ Σατανᾷ εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός** (1 Cor. v. 5)—care must be taken lest we **πλεονεκτηθῶμεν ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ**, and his soul perish likewise" (Alford). Observe that in St. Paul's writings (except chap. xii. 7; see reff.) **Σατανᾶς** takes the article, "the Satan," the adversary; it has not yet come to be regularly used as a proper name (but *cf.* Matt. iv. 10, Mark iii. 23). —**οὐ γὰρ αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ.**: *for we are not ignorant of his devices.* **νόημα** (see reff.) is generally (always in this Ep.) used in a bad sense, of the thoughts of man's unregenerate heart. Here **τὰ νοήματα** are the designs of the adversary of souls.

Vv. 12-17. HE WAS DISAPPOINTED AT NOT MEETING TITUS IN TROAS, BUT HE REJOICES NOW TO LEARN THAT HIS MESSAGE OF REPROOF HAS BEEN LOYALLY RECEIVED IN CORINTH.—Ver. 12. **ἐλθὼν δέ κ.τ.λ.**: *but* (the particle **δέ** marking the resumption of his original subject) *when I came to Troas, for the purposes of the Gospel of Christ* (*cf.* ix. 13). He stayed there seven days preaching and teaching on his return from Greece (Acts xx. 6-12). We are not to press the article and translate "the Troad"; *cf.* Acts xx. 5, 6, where we have **ἐν Τρῳάδ** and **εἰς τὴν Τρῳάδα** used of the same

y 1 Cor. xvi. 9; Col. iv. 3; Rev. iii. 8; *cf.* Isa. xlv. 1. z Rom. xvi. 12; 1 Cor. ix. 1; Eph. ii. 21. a Acts xxiv. 23; chaps. vii. 5, viii. 13; 2 Thess. i. 7 only. b Mk. vi. 46; Lk. ix. 61, xiv. 33; Acts xviii. 18, 21 only. c Rom. vi. 17, vii. 25; 1 Cor. xv. 57; chaps. viii. 16, ix. 15. d Col. ii. 15 only. e John xii. 3; Eph. v. 2; Phil. iv. 18 (Gen. viii. 21; Lev. i. 9) only; *cf.* Cant. i. 3. f Chaps. iii. 3, iv. 10, 11, v. 10, 11, vii. 12, xi. 6. g Acts ii. 47; 1 Cor. i. 18, xv. 2; 1 Pet. iii. 21.

[1] Most authorities have **τῳ μη ευρειν**; **το** LP; **του** ℵ*C² 73; **εν τῳ** DE 17.
[2] **ευρισκειν** D*. [3] 17, 37, 73 have **εν Χριστῳ Ἰησου.** [4] K omits **τῳ Θεῳ.**

θύρας μοι ἀνεῳγμένης ἐν Κυρίῳ, 13. οὐκ ἔσχηκα ἄνεσιν τῷ πνεύματί μου, τῷ μὴ εὑρεῖν με Τίτον τὸν ἀδελφόν μου· ἀλλὰ ἀποταξάμενος αὐτοῖς, ἐξῆλθον εἰς Μακεδονίαν. 14. τῷ δὲ Θεῷ χάρις τῷ πάντοτε θριαμβεύοντι ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, καὶ τὴν ὀσμὴν τῆς γνώσεως αὐτοῦ φανεροῦντι δι' ἡμῶν ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ. 15. ὅτι Χριστοῦ εὐωδία ἐσμὲν τῷ Θεῷ ἐν τοῖς σωζομένοις καὶ ἐν

place in consecutive verses. Troas would be a natural place of rendezvous, as it was the point of embarkation for Macedonia (see Acts xvi. 8); and here St. Paul had expected to meet Titus, who had been sent from Ephesus to Corinth, with an unnamed companion, as the bearer of 1 *Cor.* (see *Introd.*, p. 9).—**καὶ θύρας μοι ἀνεῳγμένης ἐν Κυρίῳ**: *and a door was opened for me in the Lord.* This is not the "door of faith" (Acts xiv. 27), but the door of opportunity at Troas (see reff. above), which he describes here as "opened," a phrase which he had used a short time before of his prospects of usefulness at Ephesus (1 Cor. xvi. 9). It is open **ἐν Κυρίῳ**; that is the sphere, as it were, of his apostolic labours (see reff.).

Ver. 13. **οὐκ ἔσχηκα ἄνεσιν τῷ πν.**: *I had no relief for my spirit.* So he says again (vii. 5) **ἐλθόντων ἡμῶν εἰς Μακεδονίαν οὐδεμίαν ἔσχηκεν ἄνεσιν ἡ σὰρξ ἡμῶν.** We are not to lay much stress on **πνεῦμα** being used here and **σάρξ** there (yet *cf.* chap. vii. 1); **σάρξ** in the later passage is used of the whole mortal nature of man, which is subject to distress and disappointment; and **πνεῦμα** here is a general term for the "mind" (*cf.* Rom. i. 9, viii. 6, xii. 11, 1 Cor. ii. 11, v. 3, xiv. 14, chap. vii. 1, 13, etc., for St. Paul's use of **πνεῦμα** for the human spirit, and see on iii. 6 below). For the tense of **ἔσχηκα**, see on i. 9.—**τῷ μὴ εὑρεῖν κ.τ.λ.**: *because I found not Titus my brother: but taking my leave of them* (*sc.*, the disciples at Troas) *I went forth into Macedonia.* **ἐξέρχεσθαι** is the word used in Acts xvi. 10, xx. 1 of "going out" of Asia to Macedonia; *cf.* viii. 17.

Ver. 14. **τῷ δὲ Θεῷ χάρις κ.τ.λ.**: *but thanks be to God, etc.* Instead of giving details of the information which Titus brought to him in Macedonia (chap. vii. 6), he bursts out into a characteristic doxology, which leads him into a long digression, the main topic of the Epistle not coming into view again until vi. 11.—**τῷ πάντοτε θριαμβεύοντι**: *who always, sc.*, even in times of anxiety and distress, *leadeth us in triumph in Christ.* **θριαμβεύειν**, "to lead as captive in a triumphal procession," occurs again in this sense Col. ii. 15. The rendering of the A.V., "which causeth us to triumph," though yielding a good sense here (and despite the causative force of verbs in **-εύω**), must be abandoned, as no clear instance of **θριαμβεύειν** in such a signification has been produced. The splendid image before the writer's mind is that of a Roman triumph, which, though he had never seen it, must have been familiar to him as it was to every citizen of the Empire. He thinks of God as the Victor (Rev. vi. 2) entering the City into which the glory and honour of the nations (Rev. xxi. 26) is brought; the Apostle as "in Christ"—as a member of the Body of Christ—is one of the captives, by means of whom the knowledge and fame of the Victor is made manifest. He rejoices that he has been so used by God, as would appear from the tidings which Titus has brought him.—**καὶ τὴν ὀσμὴν τῆς γνώσεως κ.τ.λ.**: *and maketh manifest through us the savour of the knowledge of Him* (*sc.*, of Christ) *in every place, sc.*, at Corinth as well as in Troas and Macedonia. It is possible that the metaphor of the **ὀσμή** is suggested by and is part of that of the triumph; *e.g.*, Plutarch (*Æmil. Paul.* c. 32) says that the temples were "full of fumigations" during the passage of the procession. But **ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας** is a frequent LXX phrase (see reff.).

Ver. 15. **ὅτι Χρ. εὐωδία κ.τ.λ.**: *for*

τοῖς [h] ἀπολλυμένοις· 16. οἷς μὲν ὀσμὴ [1] θανάτου [2] εἰς θάνατον, οἷς δὲ ὀσμὴ [1] ζωῆς [2] εἰς ζωήν, καὶ πρὸς ταῦτα τίς [1]ἱκανός; 17. οὐ γάρ ἐσμεν, ὡς οἱ [3] [k] πολλοὶ [1] καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ὡς [4] ἐξ [m] εἰλικρινείας, ἀλλ' [5] ὡς ἐκ Θεοῦ, κατενώπιον [6] τοῦ [7] Θεοῦ, [n] ἐν [n] Χριστῷ λαλοῦμεν.

h 1 Cor. i. 18; Chap. iv. 3; 2 Thess. ii. 10, etc.
i Reff. ver. 6.
k Rom. v. 15, 19, xii. 5; 1 Cor. x. 17, 33.
l Here only.
m Reff. i. 12.
n Rom. ix. 1; chap. xii. 19.

[1] οσμην DE.

[2] θανατου . . . ζωης DEGKL, etc.; better εκ θανατου . . . εκ ζωης ℵABC 17 and the Bohairic.

[3] οι λοιποι DEGL, g and the Syriac vss.; better, as in text, οι πολλοι, with ℵABCK, d, e, f, vg. and the Bohairic.

[4] G, the Latin and Bohairic vss. omit the second ως.

[5] G, d, e, f, g and the Harclean omit the second αλλ'.

[6] ℵ[c]DEGKL have κατενωπιον; better κατεναντι (*cf.* Rom. iv. 17 and chap. xii. 19) with ℵ*ABCP 17.

[7] ℵ[c]D[bc]EGKLP give του Θεου; better om. του with ℵ*ABCD* (*cf.* xii. 19).

we are a sweet savour of Christ unto God. Not only "through us" is the ὀσμή made manifest; we ourselves in so far as we realise and manifest our membership of Christ are, in fact, that εὐωδία. The influence of the lives of the saints is sweet and penetrative, like that of incense. From this verse comes the phrase "the odour of sanctity".—ἐν τοῖς σωζομένοις καὶ κ.τ.λ.: *among them that are being saved and among them that are perishing*. It is difficult to understand why the American Committee of Revisers objected to this rendering, and translated "are saved . . . perish". The force of the present participles ought not to be overlooked (see reff.); men in this world are either in the way of life or the way of death, but their final destiny is not to be spoken of as fixed and irrevocable while they are in the flesh. Free will involves the possibility alike of falling away from a state of grace, or of repentance from a state of sin. But for men of either class is a Christian life lived in their midst, a εὐωδία Χριστοῦ.

Ver. 16. οἷς μὲν ὀσμὴ κ.τ.λ.: *to the one a savour from death unto death; to the other a savour from life unto life;* and yet it is the same ὀσμή in both cases; *cf.* Luke ii. 34. ἐκ θανάτου εἰς θάνατον may be illustrated by Rom. i. 17, ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν (see also chap. iii. 18); emphasis is gained, according to the Hebrew idiom, by repeating the important word. The Rabbinical parallels given by Wetstein and others show that the metaphor of this verse was common among Jewish writers; they called the Law an *aroma vitae* to the good, but an *aroma mortis* to the evil.—καὶ πρὸς ταῦτα τίς ἱκανός: *who then is sufficient for these things? sc.*, to fill such a part as has been just described (for καὶ . . . τίς see on ver. 2 above). St. Paul's answer is not fully expressed, but the sequence of thought is this: "it might be thought that no one is sufficient for such a task; and yet *we* are, for we are not as the many," etc.; an answer which he is careful to explain and qualify in ver. 5 of the next chapter, lest he should be accused of undue confidence.

Ver. 17. οὐ γάρ ἐσμεν ὡς κ.τ.λ.: *for we are not as the many, viz.*, the ordinary teachers with whom you meet. The *indirect* reference is to his opponents at Corinth, though they are not named. At least he is more worthy to fill the high office of which he has been speaking than many who would be only too glad to usurp his authority; *cf.* chap. iv. 2, 1 Thess. ii. 3, 5 for similar comparisons.—καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ: *who adulterate the word of God, i.e.*, the Divine message as revealed in the Gospel (the *usual* sense in the N.T. of ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ; *cf.* iv. 2 and 2 Tim. ii. 15). κάπηλος (Ecclus. xxvi. 29) is "a huckster," and is used in Isa. i. 22 of one who adulterates wine; so the primary sense of καπηλεύειν is "to make merchandise of" (R.V. margin), which readily passed into "to corrupt" or "adulterate" for the purposes of trade.—ἀλλ' ὡς ἐξ εἰλικρινείας κ.τ.λ.: *but as of sincerity* (our subjective attitude of mind), *but as of God* (the objective source of our message

a Chaps. v. 12, x. 12, 18; *cf.* chaps. iv. 2, vi. 4, vii. 11.
b Here only.
c Ver. 3; Lk. x. 20 only; 1 Macc. xiii. 40.
d Reff. ii. 14.
e Deut. v. 26; Acts xiv. 15; Rom. ix. 26; chap. vi. 16; 1 Thess. i. 9; 1 Tim. iii. 15, etc.
f Exod. xxxi. 18; Deut. iv. 13, etc.
g Heb. ix. 4 only.
h Ezek. xi. 19, xxxvi. 26.
i Rom. vii. 14; 1 Cor. iii. 1; Heb. vii. 16 only.

III. 1. Ἀρχόμεθα[a] πάλιν[a] ἑαυτοὺς[a] συνιστάνειν[1]; εἰ[2] μὴ χρῄζομεν, ὡς[3] τινες, [b]συστατικῶν ἐπιστολῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἢ ἐξ ὑμῶν συστατικῶν[4]; 2. ἡ ἐπιστολὴ ἡμῶν ὑμεῖς ἐστε, [c]ἐγγεγραμμένη ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν,[5] γινωσκομένη καὶ ἀναγινωσκομένη ὑπὸ πάντων ἀνθρώπων· 3. [d]φανερούμενοι ὅτι ἐστὲ ἐπιστολὴ Χριστοῦ διακονηθεῖσα ὑφ' ἡμῶν, ἐγγεγραμμένη[6] οὐ μέλανι, ἀλλὰ Πνεύματι [e]Θεοῦ [e]ζῶντος, οὐκ ἐν [f]πλαξὶ [f]λιθίναις, ἀλλὰ ἐν [g]πλαξὶ [h]καρδίας[7] [h i]σαρκίναις.

[1] BD* 17 have **συνισταν**; FG **συνισταναι**; all other authorities **συνιστανειν**.

[2] **ει μη** AKLP; better **η μη** with ℵBCDEG and the primary vss.

[3] AD* have **ωσπερ**.

[4] D*EGKLP, d, e, g and the Syriac have **συστατικων** (G, g add **επιστολων**); better om. with ℵABC 17 and the Bohairic.

[5] ℵ 17 have **καρδιαις υμων**.

[6] B 67**, f, vg. have **και εγγεγρ**.

[7] FK and most vss. support **καρδιας**; better **καρδιαις** with ℵABCDEGLP and the Harclean. W.H. suggest that the second **πλαξι** was introduced through a primitive clerical error.

and of our commission to speak), *in the sight of God* (*sc.*, in the consciousness of His presence; *cf.* ver. 10 above), *speak we in Christ*, *sc.*, as members of Christ's Body, in fellowship with Him. This solemn and impressive confirmation of what has been said is repeated, chap. xii. 19, **κατέναντι Θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ λαλοῦμεν.**

Chapter III.—Vv. 1-3. The Corinthians are St. Paul's "Epistle of Commendation".—Ver. 1. **ἀρχόμεθα πάλιν ἑαυτοὺς συνιστ.**: *are we beginning again* (*sc.*, as, for instance, in 1 Cor. ix. 15, xiv. 18, xv. 10, or possibly he alludes to i. 12 above; *cf.* chap. v. 12, x. 18 below) *to commend ourselves?* His opponents seem to have made this charge, which he is careful to repudiate again (x. 12; *cf.* xii. 11). The phrase **ἑαυτὸν συνιστάνειν** (or **συνιστάναι**, for both forms occur) is found four times in this Epistle (see reff.), and always in a bad sense, the prominent place of **ἑαυτὸν** signifying that there has been undue egotism; on the other hand, **συνιστάνειν ἑαυτὸν**, which occurs three times (see reff.), is always used in a good sense, of that legitimate commendation of himself and his message which every faithful minister will adopt. Neither form occurs elsewhere in the N.T. (unless Gal. ii. 18, **παραβάτην ἐμαυτὸν συνιστάνω**, be regarded as an exception).—**ἢ μὴ χρῄζομεν κ.τ.λ.**: *or do we need, as some do* (*i.e.*, the **οἱ πολλοί** of ii. 17; **τινες** is his usual vague description of opponents; see 1 Cor. iv. 18, xv. 12, chap. x. 2, Gal. i. 7, 1 Tim. i. 3, 19), *epistles of commendation to you or from you?* Greek teachers used to give **ἐπιστολαὶ συστατικαί** (Diogenes Laert., viii. 87); for such commendatory mention *cf.* Acts xv. 25 (of Judas and Silas to the Church at Antioch), Acts xviii. 27 (of Apollos to the Church at Corinth), Rom. xvi. 1 (of Phœbe to the Church at Rome), chap. viii. 16-24 (of Titus and his companions to the Church at Corinth); *cf.* also 1 Cor. xvi. 3. St. Paul scouts the idea that he, who first brought the Gospel to Corinth, should need to present formal credentials to the Corinthian Church; and it would be equally anomalous that he should seek recommendations *from* them (**ἐξ ὑμῶν**). He has testimonies to his character and office far superior to any that could be written on papyrus. These can be pointed to if any object that his Apostolic office was self-assumed, and that he delivers the Gospel message in his own way and on his own authority (Gal. i. 12).

Ver. 2. **ἡ ἐπιστολὴ ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ.**: *ye are our epistle.* They are his credentials. *Cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 2, where he tells them that they are the "seal" of his apostleship. Note the emphasis laid on **ἐπιστολή** by its position in the sentence.—**ἐγγεγραμμένη ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν**: *written in our hearts*, *i.e.*, in the heart of me, Paul (*cf.* vii. 3); a somewhat unexpected, and, as it were, parenthetic application of the metaphor, suggested by the memory of

4. [k] Πεποίθησιν δὲ τοιαύτην ἔχομεν[1] διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν[1]· 5. οὐχ ὅτι [l]ἱκανοί ἐσμεν ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν λογίσασθαί τι,[4] ὡς[5] ἐξ ἑαυτῶν,[6] ἀλλ' ἡ [m]ἱκανότης ἡμῶν ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, 6. ὃς καὶ [n]ἱκάνωσεν ἡμᾶς [o]διακόνους [p]καινῆς [p]διαθήκης, οὐ [q]γράμματος,[7] ἀλλὰ [q]πνεύ-

k Reff. i. 15.
l Reff. ii. 6.
m Here only.
n Col. i. 12 only.
o *Cf.* Eph. iii. 7; Col. i. 23.
p Mt. xxvi. 28; Lk. xxii. 20; 1 Cor. xi. 25; Heb. viii. 8 (Jer. xxxi. 31), ix. 15.
q Rom. ii. 29, vii. 6.

[1] A has **εχω**.

[2] **αφ εαυτων** is placed as in text by KL and the Harclean, and after **λογισασθαι τι** by ADEGP and the Latins; its true place is before **ικανοι εσμεν** with ℵBC 73 and the Bohairic; 17 and the Peshitto omit **αφ' εαυτων** altogether.

[3] CDEG give **λογιζεσθαι** for **λογισασθαι** of ℵABKLP.

[4] B om. **τι**; P has the order **τι λογιζεσθαι**.

[5] C om. **ως** as unnecessary for the sense. [6] **αυτων** BG for **εαυτων**.

[7] 17 has **ου γραμματι αλλα πνευματι**, which the Latin vss. follow.

his labours among them which had left an indelible impression upon his heart.—**γινωσκ. καὶ ἀναγινωσκ. κ.τ.λ.**: *known and read of all men.* This is the legitimate application of the metaphor, and is expanded in the next verse. The letter written on St. Paul's heart was not open to the world; but the letter written on the heart of the Corinthians by Christ through St. Paul's ministry was patent to the world's observation, as it was reflected in their Christian mode of life. Facts speak louder than words. For the jingle **γινωσκομένη . . . ἀναγινωσκομένη** *cf.* Acts viii. 30, **γινώσκεις ἃ ἀναγινώσκεις**, and see the note on i. 13 above.

Ver. 3. **φανερούμενοι ὅτι ἐστὲ κ.τ.λ.**: *being made manifest that ye are an epistle of Christ* (*sc.*, written by Christ), *ministered by us* (the Apostle conceiving of himself as his Master's amanuensis).—**ἐγγεγραμμένη οὐ μέλανι κ.τ.λ.**: *written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone but in tables that are hearts of flesh.* This "writing" which the Corinthians exhibit is no writing with ink on a papyrus roll, but is the mystical imprint of the Divine Spirit in their hearts, conveyed through Paul's ministrations; *cf.* Jer. xxxi. 33, Prov. vii. 3. And this leads him to think of the ancient "writing" of the Law by the "finger of God" on the Twelve Tables, and to contrast it with this epistle of Christ on tables that are not of stone but are "hearts of flesh" (see reff.). For **σάρκινος** (*cf.* **λίθινος, ὀστράκινος**) see on i. 12 above.

Vv. 4-6. HIS SUCCESS IN THE MINISTRY OF THE NEW COVENANT IS ALTOGETHER DUE TO GOD.—Ver. 4. **πεποίθησιν δὲ τοιαύτην κ.τ.λ.**: *and such confidence have we through Christ towards God* (*cf.* Rom. iv. 2, v. 1 for a like use of **πρὸς τὸν Θεόν**). That is "*we* are sufficient for these things" (see ii. 16, 17); but he hastens to explain the true source of his confidence.

Ver. 5. **οὐχ ὅτι ἱκανοί κ.τ.λ.**: *not that we are sufficient of ourselves to judge anything as from ourselves; sc.*, to judge rightly of the methods to be followed in the discharge of the Apostolic ministry; there is no thought here of the natural depravity of man, or the like. For the constr. **οὐχ ὅτι . . .** *cf.* i. 24 and reff. **λογίζεσθαι** is here used in its widest sense of carrying on any of the ordinary processes of reasoning (*cf.* x. 7, xii. 6). The repetition **ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν . . . ἐξ ἑαυτῶν** emphasises the statement of the need of God's grace. St. Paul's habit of dwelling on a word and coming back to it again and again (an artifice which the Latin rhetoricians called *traductio*) is well illustrated in this passage. We have **ἱκανοί, ἱκανότης, ἱκάνωσεν**; **γραμμα** (following **ἐγγεγραμμένη** in ver. 2); **διακονηθεῖσα, διάκονος, διακονία**; and **δόξα** eight times between vv. 7-11. With the sentiment **ἡ ἱκανότης ἡμῶν ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ**, *cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 10 and chap. xii. 9.

Ver. 6. **ὃς καὶ ἱκάνωσεν κ.τ.λ.**: *who also* ("qui idem"; *cf.* 1 Cor. i. 8) *made us sufficient as ministers of the New Covenant*—[ministers] *not of the letter* (*i.e.*, the Law), *but of the Spirit; for the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life.* The Apostle's opponents at Corinth were probably Judaisers (xi. 22), and thus the description of his office as the **διακονία καινῆς διαθήκης** leads him to a comparison and a contrast of the Old Covenant and the New. The "covenants" (Rom.

r John vi. 63; Rom. viii. 11; Cor. xv. 45; *cf.* 1 Pet. iii. 18 and Rom. viii. 10.
s Here only.
t Exod. xxxiv. 29-35.
u Acts i. 10, iii. 4, vi. 15, vii. 55, xi. 6, xiii. 9.

ματος· τὸ γὰρ γράμμα ἀποκτείνει,[1] τὸ δὲ [r]πνεῦμα [r]ζωοποιεῖ. 7. [s]εἰ δὲ ἡ διακονία τοῦ θανάτου ἐν γράμμασιν,[2] [s]ἐντετυπωμένη ἐν[3] λίθοις, ἐγενήθη ἐν δόξῃ, [t]ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι [u]ἀτενίσαι τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ [u]εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον Μωσέως[4] διὰ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ προσώπου

[1] B has **αποκτεινει**; but ℵGKP 17 have **αποκτεννει**, and ACDEL **αποκτενει**; Lachmann conjectured **αποκταινει**.

[2] BD*G and the Peshitto have **γραμματι**.

[3] ℵcDbcEKL, d, e, f support **εν λιθοις**; om. **εν** ℵ*ABCD*GP 17, g.

[4] The more accurate spelling is **Μωυσεως** (ℵBCGKL, etc.); and so at vv. 13, 15.

ix. 4, Eph. ii. 12) between Jehovah and Israel were the foundation of Judaism. They began (not to speak of the Covenant with Noah) with the Covenant of Circumcision granted to Abraham (Gen. xvii. 2) and repeated more than once (Gen. xxii. 16, xxvi. 3), which is often appealed to in the N.T. (Luke i. 72, Acts iii. 25, vii. 8, etc.). This was not abrogated (Gal. iii. 17) by the Covenant of Sinai (Exod. xix. 5; *cf.*, for its recapitulation in Moab, Deut. xxix. 1), which, as the National Charter of Israel, was pre-eminently to a Hebrew "the Old Covenant". The great prophecy of a Deliverer from Zion (Isa. lix. 21) is interpreted by St. Paul (Rom. xi. 27) as the "covenant" of which the prophet spoke in the next verse; and Jeremiah, in a passage (xxxi. 31-33) from which the Apostle has just now (ver. 3 above) borrowed a striking image, had proclaimed a New Covenant with Israel in the future. The phrase had been consecrated to the Gospel, through its employment by Christ at the Institution of the Eucharist (Matt. xxvi. 28, Luke xxii. 20, 1 Cor. xi. 25); and in that solemn context it bore direct allusion to the Blood of Sprinkling which ratified the Old Covenant of Sinai (Exod. xxiv. 8). It is of this "New Covenant" that St. Paul is a **διάκονος** (Christ is its **μεσίτης**, Heb. ix. 15); *i.e.*, he is a **διάκονος οὐ γράμματος ἀλλὰ πνεύματος**, not of the letter of the Law (as might be wrongly inferred from his statement in ver. 3 that the **ἐπιστολὴ Χριστοῦ** was "ministered" [**διακονηθεῖσα**] by him), but of the "Spirit of the living God" (ver. 3). This is a much more gracious **διακονία**, inasmuch as the Law is the instrument of Death (*cf.* Rom. v. 20, vii. 9, viii. 2, in all which passages the Apostle brings into closest connexion the three thoughts of the *Law*, *Sin*, and *Death*), but the Spirit of God is the Giver of Life (see reff. and *cf.* Gal. iii. 21, where he notes that the law is not able, **ζωοποιεῖν**, "to give life"). It will be observed that the article is wanting before **καινῆς διαθήκης**, as it is before **γράμματος** and **πνεύματος**; but we need not on that account with the Revisers translate "*a* new covenant". The expression "New Covenant," like the words "Letter" (for the Law) and "Spirit" for the Holy Spirit, was a technical phrase in the theology of the day; and so might well dispense with the article. The contrast between "letter" and "Spirit" here (so often misunderstood, as if it pointed to a contrast between what is verbally stated and what is really implied, and so justified an appeal from the bare "letter" of the law to the principles on which it rests) is exactly illustrated by Rom. vii. 6, where St. Paul declares that the service of a Christian is **ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος καὶ οὐ παλαιότητι γράμματος**, *i.e.*, "in newness of the Spirit and not in oldness of the letter". And (though not so plainly) the same contrast is probably intended in Rom. ii. 29. In St. Paul's writings **πνεῦμα**, when used for the human spirit, is contrasted with **σῶμα** (1 Cor. v. 3), **σάρξ** (2 Cor. vii. 1) and **νοῦς** (1 Cor. xiv. 14), but *never* with **γράμμα**. This is a technical term for the "Law" (like **γραφή**, Scripture; *cf.* ver. 7, **ἐν γράμμασιν**), and is properly set over against the "Spirit" of God, whose office and work were first plainly revealed in the Gospel.

Vv. 7-11. DIGRESSION ON THE MINISTRY OF THE NEW COVENANT. IT IS (*a*) MORE GLORIOUS THAN THAT OF THE OLD. —Ver. 7. **εἰ δὲ ἡ διακονία κ.τ.λ.**: *but if the Ministration of Death* (see ver. 6), *written, and engraven in stones, came into existence in glory, etc.* The reference is to the glory on the face of Moses (see reff.) when the Tables of the Law were brought down from Mount Sinai.

αὐτοῦ τὴν καταργουμένην, 8. πῶς οὐχὶ μᾶλλον ἡ διακονία τοῦ πνεύματος ἔσται ἐν δόξῃ; 9. εἰ γὰρ ἡ[1] διακονία τῆς [y]κατακρίσεως [w]δόξα,[2] [w]πολλῷ [w]μᾶλλον περισσεύει[3] ἡ διακονία τῆς διακαιοσύνης ἐν[4] δόξῃ. 10. καὶ γὰρ οὐδὲ[5] δεδόξασται τὸ δεδοξασμένον [x]ἐν [x]τούτῳ τῷ [x]μέρει, ἕνεκεν[6] τῆς [y]ὑπερβαλλούσης δόξης. 11. εἰ γὰρ τὸ καταργούμενον διὰ δόξης, [z]πολλῷ [z]μᾶλλον τὸ μένον ἐν δόξῃ.

v Chap. vii. 3 only. w Rom. v. 9, 10; 1 Cor. xii. 22; Phil. i. 23, ii. 12 and ver. 11. x Chap. ix. 3; *cf.* Col. ii. 16. y Chap. ix. 14; Eph. i. 19, ii. 7, iii. 19 only; 2 Macc. iv. 13. z Reff. ver. 9.

[1] BDᵇEKLP, f, g and the Bohairic support **η διακ.**; **τῃ διακονιᾳ** ℵACD*G 17, d, e and the Syriac vss. The external evidence is thus evenly balanced, but the form of the sentence inclines us to the received text.

[2] D*EG supply **εστιν** after **δοξα.**

[3] DE, d, e, g and the Syriac vss. give **περισσευσει.**

[4] ℵᶜDEGKLP support **εν δοξῃ**; ℵ*ABC omit **εν.**

[5] Only a few cursives (and d, e, f, g) support **ουδε**; all uncials and the Bohairic have **ου.**

[6] For **ενεκεν** read **εινεκεν** with ℵABDEGP.

St. Paul argues that for two reasons the glory of the New Covenant is greater, (i.) the former **διακονία** was one of condemnation, the latter of righteousness (ver. 9), and (ii.) the glory of the former was only a transient gleam, while that of the latter abides for ever (ver. 11). Of the first Tables which Moses broke in anger it is said that the writing was **γραφὴ Θεοῦ κεκολαμμένη ἐν τοῖς πλαξίν** (Exod. xxxii. 16); it is merely said of the second Tables that Moses wrote upon them "the words of the Covenant, the Ten Commandments" (Exod. xxxiv. 28). Nevertheless the tradition (see Philo, *Vit. Mos.*, iii., 2) was that the second Tables, like the first, were not only "written" but "engraven" (**ἐντετυπωμένη**), as the Apostle has it.—**ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι κ.τ.λ.**: *so that the Children of Israel could not* (*sc.*, through fear, Exod. xxxiv. 30) *look steadfastly upon the face of Moses on account of the glory of his face, transient as it was.* **καταργεῖσθαι** is nearly always, if not always (for 1 Cor. ii. 6 is doubtful), passive in St. Paul (Rom. vi. 6, vii. 2, 1 Cor. xiii. 8, xv. 26, Gal. v. 4), and as it must be taken passively in ver. 14 below, there is a good deal to be said for regarding it as passive here and in vv. 11, 13 (as the A.V. does; note, however, that the translation "which was *to be* done away" in this verse is wrong). Yet the sense seems to require the middle voice "which was passing away," *sc.*, even as he spoke to the people. The position of **τὴν καταργουμένην** gives it emphasis. Pfleiderer is guilty of the extravagant supposition that the whole story of the Transfiguration (*cf.* Luke ix. 28 ff.) is built up on the basis of this passage (*cf.* **μεταμορφούμεθα,** ver. 18), the disappearance of Moses and Elijah, leaving Jesus alone with His disciples, indicating that the glory of the Old Covenant was passing away (**καταργουμένην**)!

Vv. 8, 9. **πῶς οὐχὶ μᾶλλον κ.τ.λ.**: *how shall not rather the Ministration of the Spirit be with glory? For if the Ministration of Condemnation be glory* (if we read **τῃ διακονίᾳ** we must render, with the American Revisers, "*has* glory"), *much rather doth the Ministration of Righteousness exceed in glory.* *Cf.* Rom. v. 16, **τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρίμα ἐξ ἑνὸς εἰς κατάκριμα, τὸ δὲ χάρισμα ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς δικαίωμα,** and Rom. viii. 1, **οὐδὲν γὰρ νῦν κατάκριμα τοῖς ἐν Χρ. Ἰῃ.** The phrase **διάκονοι δικαιοσύνης** is used again at xi. 15, as descriptive of the ministers of the New Covenant; it is an essential point of Pauline theology that "righteousness" is not of the "law" (Gal. iii. 21). The argument is *a minori ad majus.*

Ver. 10. **καὶ γὰρ οὐ δεδόξασται**: *for that which hath been made glorious, sc.*, the Ministration of the Old Covenant, *hath not* [really] *been made glorious in this respect, viz., on account of the surpassing glory* (of the Ministration of the New Covenant); *i.e.*, the surpassing glory of the second made the glory of the first seem nought. The phraseology of Exod. xxxiv. 35 (**τὸ πρόσωπον Μωσῆ . . . δεδόξασται**) is still in the Apostle's mind. **ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει** has been otherwise explained as equivalent to "in this in-

12. ἔχοντες οὖν τοιαύτην ἐλπίδα, πολλῇ [a]παρρησίᾳ χρώμεθα· 13. καὶ οὐ καθάπερ [b]Μωσῆς ἐτίθει [c]κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὸ [b]πρόσωπον ἑαυτοῦ,[1] πρὸς τὸ μὴ [d]ἀτενίσαι τοὺς υἱοὺς [e]Ἰσραὴλ [d]εἰς τὸ[2] τέλος[3] τοῦ καταργουμένου· 14. ἀλλ' [e]ἐπωρώθη τὰ [f]νοήματα αὐτῶν· ἄχρι γὰρ τῆς σήμερον[4] τὸ αὐτὸ κάλυμμα ἐπὶ[5] τῇ [g]ἀναγνώσει τῆς [h]παλαιᾶς [h]διαθήκης μένει μὴ [i]ἀνακαλυπτόμενον, ὅ[6] τι ἐν Χριστῷ καταργεῖται·

a Chap. vii. 4; Eph. iii. 12, vi. 19; Phil. i. 20; Col. ii. 15; 1 Tim. iii. 13.
b Exod. xxxiv. 33, 35.
c Here only.
d Reff. ver. 7.
e Mk. vi. 52, viii. 17; John xii. 40; Rom. xi. 7 only.
f Reff. ii. 11.
g Acts xiii. 15; 1 Tim. iv. 13 only; Neh. viii. 8.
h Here only.
i Ver. 18 only; *cf.* Job xii. 22.

[1] ℵDEK support **εαυτου**; better **αυτου** ABCGLP 17. (Yet B has **εαυτου**, Exod. xxxiv. 35.)

[2] D*G om. **το** before **τελος**.

[3] A, f have **προσωπον** for **τελος** (a manifest error due to the **προσωπον** in the line before).

[4] Better **σημερον ημερας** (*cf.* Acts xx. 26, Rom. xi. 8) with ℵABCDEGP and most vss.; the received text in omitting **ημερας** follows KL and the Peshitto.

[5] DEG have **εν** for **επι**. [6] **ο τι** should be written **οτι**, as by Tisch. and W.H.

stance of Moses"; but it seems (see ref.) to be merely a redundant phrase, added for the sake of emphasis, introducing **ἕνεκεν τῆς ὑπερβ. δόξ.**

Ver. 11. **εἰ γὰρ τὸ καταργ. κ.τ.λ.**: *for if that which passes away was with glory, much more that which abideth is in glory*. The difference of prepositions **διὰ δόξης . . . ἐν δόξῃ** should not be overlooked; the Ministration of the Old Covenant was only *with* a transient flush of glory, that of the New abides *in* glory (*cf.* esp. Heb. xii. 18-27). It is true that St. Paul sometimes changes his prepositions in cases where we find difficult to assign a sufficient reason (*e.g.*, **διά** and **ἐκ**, Rom. iii. 30, Gal. ii. 16); but that is no reason for confusing the force of **διὰ** and **ἐν**, when the preservation of the distinction between them adds point to the passage (*cf.* Rom. v. 10, where **διὰ** and **ἐν** are again confused in the A.V.). See further on vi. 8.

Vv. 12-18. The Ministry of the New Covenant is (*b*) Open, not Veiled, as was that of the Old. The illustration from the O.T. which is used in these verses has been obscured for English readers by the faulty rendering of the A.V. in Exod. xxxiv. 33. It would appear from that rendering, *viz.*, "*till* Moses had done speaking with them he put a veil on his face," that the object of the veil was to conceal from the people the Divine glory reflected in his face. But this is to misrepresent the original Hebrew, and is not the rendering given either by the LXX or by modern scholars. The R.V. substitutes *when* for *till* in the verse just quoted, thus bringing out the point that the veil was used to conceal *not* the glory on the face of Moses, but its *evanescence;* it was fading even while he spoke, and this by his use of the veil he prevented the people from perceiving. When he "went in unto the Lord" again he took the veil off. The Apostle applies all this to the Israel of his day. Still a veil is between them and the Divine glory—a veil "upon their hearts" which prevents them from seeing the transitoriness of the Old Covenant; yet, as it was of old, if they turn to the Lord, the veil is removed, and an open vision is granted. St. Paul is fond of such allegorisings of the history of the Exodus; *cf.*, *e.g.*, 1 Cor. x. 2, Gal. iv. 25.

Ver. 12. **ἔχοντες οὖν τοιαύτην κ.τ.λ.**: *having therefore such a hope* (*sc.*, of the glorious Ministration of the Spirit, ver. 8; *cf.* ver. 4) *we use great boldness of speech*. The verses which follow are parenthetical down to ver. 18, where the subject is again *we*, *i.e.*, all Christian believers, as contrasted with Jews.

Ver. 13. **καὶ οὐ καθάπερ κ.τ.λ.**: *and* (we put no veil upon our face) *as Moses put a veil upon his face*. The construction is broken, but the sense is obvious; *cf.*, for a somewhat similar abbreviation, Mark xv. 8, **ὁ ὄχλος ἤρξατο αἰτεῖσθαι καθὼς ἐποίει αὐτοῖς.—πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἀτενίσαι κ.τ.λ.**: *to the end that the children of Israel should not look steadfastly on the end of that which was passing away*, *sc.*, the evanescence of the glory on Moses' face. The A.V., "could not steadfastly look to the end of that which

15. ἀλλ' [k] ἕως [k] σήμερον, ἡνίκα [1] ἀναγινώσκεται [2] Μωσῆς, κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν κεῖται [3]· 16. [1] ἡνίκα δ' [4] ἂν [m] ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς [1] Κύριον, [1] περιαιρεῖται τὸ [1] κάλυμμα. 17. ὁ δὲ Κύριος τὸ Πνεῦμά

[k] Ecclus. xlvii. 7; Matt. xxvii. 8; *cf.* Deut. xxix. 4. Exod. xxxiv. 34. [m] Exod. xxxiv. 31.

[1] DEGKLP support **ηνικα αναγιν.**; better **ηνικα αν αναγιν.** with ℵABC 17.

[2] GKL support **αναγινωσκεται**; better **αναγινωσκηται** with ℵABCDEP.

[3] D*EG, the Latins and the Bohairic place **κειται** before **επι την καρδιαν αυτων.**

[4] ℵcBDEGKLP support **δ' αν**; but ℵ*A 17 give **δε εαν.** C omits **αν.**

was abolished," evidently takes **τέλος** as standing for Christ, the fulfilment of the Mosaic law (Rom. x. 4). But this is not suitable to the context. **πρὸς τό** with an infinitive is sometimes found to express the aim or intention (*never* the mere result), as, *e.g.*, Eph. vi. 11, 1 Thess. ii. 9, 2 Thess. iii. 8.

Ver. 14. **ἀλλ' ἐπωρώθη τὰ νοήματα αὐτῶν**: *but their minds were blinded, sc.*, in reference to what they saw (*cf.* Rom. xi. 25); they took the brightness for an abiding glory (*cf.* Deut. xxix. 4). **πῶρος,** which primarily means a kind of marble, came to mean, in medical writers, a hardening of the tissues; and hence we have **πωρόω,** (1) *to petrify*, (2) *to become insensible* or *obtuse*, and so (3) it comes to be used of insensibility of the organs of vision, *to blind*. (See J. A. Robinson in *Journal of Theological Studies*, Oct., 1901, and *cf.* reff. above.)—**ἄχρι γὰρ τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας κ.τ.λ.**: *for until this very day at the reading of the Old Covenant the same veil remaineth unlifted* (*for it is* only *done away in Christ*). (1) Some commentators take **μὴ ἀνακαλυπτόμενον** as a nominative absolute, and translate "the same veil remaineth, it not being revealed that it (*sc.*, either the veil or the Old Covenant) is done away in Christ". But the order of the words seems to force us to take the present participle with **μένει** —it having a merely explanatory force and being almost redundant. (2) Again both A.V. and R.V. (text), while translating the first part of the clause as we have done, render **ὅ τι ἐν Χρ. καταργεῖται** "which veil is done away in Christ". But it seems indefensible thus to take **ὅ τι** as equivalent to **ὅ.** (3) Field arrives at yet another rendering by taking **κάλυμμα** *per synecdochem* for the *thing veiled*, which is here declared to be the fact that the Old Covenant is done away in Christ. He renders "the same mystery remaineth unrevealed, *namely*, that it is done away in Christ". But it is a grave objection to this that **τὸ κάλυμμα** has to be taken in a sense different from that which it has all through the rest of the passage. (4) We prefer, therefore (with Schmiedel and Schnedermann), to read **ὅ τι** as **ὅτι**, *for*, and to regard the phrase **ὅτι ἐν Χρ. καταργεῖται** as parenthetical: "until this day the veil remains unlifted (for it is only in Christ that it is done away)"; *i.e.*, the Jews do not recognise the vanishing away of the glory of the Law, which yet is going on before their eyes. How completely Judaism was dissociated in St. Paul's mind from Christianity is plain from the striking phrase **ἡ παλαιὰ διαθήκη** (here only found; but *cf.* ver. 6), by which he describes the religious system of his own early manhood, which had only been superseded by **ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη** thirty years before he wrote this letter. **ἀνάγνωσις** is (see reff.) the public reading of the Law in the synagogues; it seems, however, unnecessarily ingenious to see here, with Schmiedel, an allusion in **τὸ κάλυμμα** to the covers in which the Synagogue Rolls were preserved.

Ver. 15. **ἀλλ' ἕως σήμερον κ.τ.λ.**: *but unto this day, whensoever Moses* (*sc.*, the Law; *cf.* Acts xv. 21) *is read, a veil lieth upon their heart.* It will be observed that the image has been changed as the application of Exod. xxxiv. 29 ff. proceeds: in that history the veil was upon *the face of Moses;* here it is upon *the heart of the people*, as God speaks to them through the medium of the Law (see above on ver. 2 for a similar change in the application of the metaphor suggested by the word **ἐπιστολή**).

Ver. 16. **ἡνίκα δ' ἂν κ.τ.λ.**: *but whensoever it, i.e.*, Israel, *shall turn to the Lord, the veil is taken away;* a paraphrase of Exod. xxxiv. 34, **ἡνίκα δ' ἂν εἰσεπορεύετο Μωσῆς ἔναντι Κυρίου λαλεῖν αὐτῷ, περιῃρεῖτο τὸ κάλυμμα ἕως τοῦ ἐκπορεύεσθαι.**

Ver. 17. **ὁ δὲ Κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν**: *but the* LORD, *i.e.*, the Jehovah of Israel,

n 1 Kings xviii. 12; 2 Kings ii. 16; Isa. lxi. 1 (Lk. iv. 18); Acts v. 9, viii. 39.

ἐστιν· οὗ δὲ τὸ [n] Πνεῦμα [n] Κυρίου,[1] ἐκεῖ[2] [o] ἐλευθερία. 18. ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντες, [p] ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν [q] δόξαν Κυρίου [r] κατοπτριζόμενοι, τὴν αὐτὴν [s] εἰκόνα [t] μεταμορφούμεθα[3] ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν,

o Rom. viii. 21; 1 Cor. x. 29; Gal. ii. 4, v. 1, 13. p Reff. ver. 14. q *Cf.* Exod. xxxiii. 19. r Here only. s Rom. viii. 29; 1 Cor. xi. 7, xv. 49; chap. iv. 4; Col. i. 15, iii. 10. t Matt. xvii. 2; Mk. ix. 2; Rom. xii. 2 only.

[1] L has **το αγιον** instead of **Κυριου**, and two cursives omit **Κυριου**. Hort suggested that **Κυριου** is a primitive error for **Κυριον**; but this seems quite unnecessary; see note below and reff.

[2] Om. **εκει** ℵABCD* 17, 1, the Peshitto and the Bohairic; it is thus inadequately supported and, moreover, is not in St. Paul's style (*cf.* Rom. iv. 15, v. 20).

[3] A **μεταμορφουμενοι.**

spoken of in the preceding quotation, *is the Spirit*, the Author of the New Covenant of grace, to whom the new Israel is invited to turn (*cf.* Acts ix. 35). It is quite perverse to compare 1 Cor. xv. 45 (where it is said that Christ, as "the last Adam," became **πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν**) or Ignatius, *Mag.*, § 15, **ἀδιάκριτον πνεῦμα ὅς ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός**, and to find here an "identification" of Christ with the Holy Spirit. **ὁ Κύριος** is here not Christ, but the Jehovah of Israel spoken of in Exod. xxxiv. 34; and in St. Paul's application of the narrative of the Veiling of Moses, the counterpart of **ὁ Κύριος** under the New Covenant is the Spirit, which has been already contrasted in the preceding verses (vv. 3, 6) with the letter of the Mosaic law. At the same time it is true that the identification of "the Lord" (*i.e.*, the Son) and "the Spirit" intermittently appears afterwards in Christian theology. See (for reff.) Swete in *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, iii., 115*a*.—**οὗ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα κ.τ.λ.**: *and where the Spirit of the Lord is*, there *is liberty; sc.*, in contradistinction to the servile fear of Exod. xxxiv. 30; *cf.* John viii. 32, Rom. viii. 15, Gal. iv. 7, in all of which passages the freedom of Christian service is contrasted with the bondage of the Law. The thought here is not of the freedom of the Spirit's action (John iii. 8, 1 Cor. xii. 11), but of the freedom of access to God under the New Covenant, as exemplified in the removal of the veil, when the soul turns itself to the Divine glory. "The Spirit of the Lord" is an O.T. phrase (see reff.). We now return to the thought of ver. 12, the openness and boldness of the Apostolical service.

Ver. 18. **ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντες κ.τ.λ.**: *but we all, sc.*, you as well as I, all Christian believers, *with unveiled face* (and so not as Moses under the Old Covenant), *reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord, sc.*, of Jehovah (see reff.), which is the glory of Christ (*cf.* John xvii. 24), *are transformed into the same image, sc.*, of Christ (see reff.), *from glory to glory* (*i.e.*, progressively and without interruption, and so unlike the transitory reflection of the Divine glory on the face of Moses; *cf.* Ps. lxxxiv. 7, and on chap. ii. 16 above), *as from* (not "by" as the A.V.) *the Lord the Spirit; sc.*, our progress in glory is continuous, as becomes the work of the Spirit from whom it springs (John xvi. 14, Rom. viii. 11). The meaning of **κατοπτρίζεσθαι** (which is not found elsewhere in the Greek Bible) is somewhat doubtful. (i.) The analogy of 1 Cor. xiii. 12, of Philo, *Leg. All.*, iii., 33 (a passage where Exod. xxxiii. 18 is paraphrased, and which therefore is specially apposite here), and of Clem. Rom., § 36, would support the rendering of the A.V., "beholding as in a glass" (*i.e.*, a mirror). This is also given in the margin of the R.V., and is preferred by the American Revisers. But such a translation is not appropriate to the context, for the Apostle's thought is not of any indirect vision of the Divine glory, but of our freedom of access thereto and of perception thereof. It seems better therefore (ii.) to render with the R.V. (following Chrysostom) *reflecting as in a mirror*. And so the image conveyed is "that Christians having, like Moses, received in their lives the reflected glory of the Divine presence, as Moses received it on his countenance, are unlike Moses in that they have no fear, such as his, of its vanishing away, but are confident of its continuing to shine in them with increasing lustre (*cf.* iv. 6 below); and in this confidence present themselves without veil or disguise, inviting enquiry

καθάπερ[1] ἀπὸ Κυρίου Πνεύματος. IV. 1. Διὰ τοῦτο ἔχοντες τὴν[a] διακονίαν ταύτην, καθὼς ἠλεήθημεν, οὐκ[a] ἐκκακοῦμεν,[2] 2. ἀλλ'[b] ἀπειπάμεθα τὰ[c] κρυπτὰ τῆς[d] αἰσχύνης, μὴ[e] περιπατοῦντες[e] ἐν[f] πανουργίᾳ, μηδὲ[g] δολοῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ τῇ[h] φανερώσει τῆς ἀληθείας[i] συνιστῶντες[3] [i] ἑαυτοὺς πρὸς πᾶσαν[k] συνείδησιν ἀνθρώπων [l] ἐνώπιον τοῦ [l] Θεοῦ. 3. [m] εἰ δὲ [m] καὶ ἔστι κεκαλυμμένον τὸ[n] εὐαγ-

[a] Lk. xviii. 1; Gal. vi. 9; Eph. iii. 13; 2 Thess. iii. 13; and ver. 16. [b] Here only; Job x. 3. [c] Rom. ii. 16; 1 Cor. iv. 5, xiv. 25; 1 Pet. iii. 4. [d] Phil. iii. 19; Jude 13; *cf.* Rom. vi. 21; Eph. v. 12. [e] Acts xxi. 21; Rom. vi. 4; Eph. v. 2; Col. iii. 7, etc. [f] Chap. xi. 3; 1 Cor. iii. 19; Eph. iv. 14; *cf.* chap. xii. 16. [g] Here only; Ps. xiv. 3, xxxv. 3. [h] 1 Cor. xii. 7 only. [i] Chap. vi. 4, vii. 11; *cf.* chap. iii. 1, v. 12, x. 12, 18. [k] Reff. i. 12. [l] Rom. xiv. 22; chap. vii. 12; Gal. i. 20; 1 Tim v. 4, 21; 2 Tim. iv. 1; *cf.* chap. viii. 21. [m] 1 Cor. iv. 7; *cf.* chap. iv. 16, v. 16, vii. 8. [n] 1 Thess. i. 5; 2 Thess. ii. 14; *cf.* Rom. ii. 16, xvi. 25; 1 Cor. xv. 1; 2 Tim. ii. 8.

[1] B has καθωσπερ. [2] The better orthography is εγκακουμεν ℵABD*G 17.

[3] DcEKL give συνιστωντες; better συνισταντες ℵCD*G 17, followed by Tisch., or συνιστανοντες A(?)BP, adopted by W.H.

instead of deprecating it, with nothing to hold back or to conceal from the eager gaze of the most suspicious or the most curious" (Stanley). The words **Κυρίου πνεύματος** will bear various renderings: (*a*) *the Lord of the Spirit*, which is not apposite here, (*b*) *the Spirit of the Lord*, as the A.V. takes them and the Latin commentators generally, (*c*) *the Spirit, which is the Lord*, the rendering of Chrysostom, which is given a place in the R.V. margin, and (*d*) *the Lord, the Spirit*, **πνεύματος** being placed in apposition to **Κυρίου**, neither word taking the article, as the first does not after the prep. **ἀπό**. We unhesitatingly adopt (*d*), the rendering of the R.V., inasmuch as it best brings out the identification of **Κύριος** and **πνεῦμα** in ver. 17. It is worth noticing that the phrase in the "Nicene" Creed **τὸ πνεῦμα . . . τὸ Κύριον τὸ ζωοποιόν** is based on the language of this verse and of ver. 6 above.

CHAPTER IV.—Vv. 1-6. HE DELIVERS WITH FRANKNESS HIS MESSAGE OF CHRIST THE TRUE LIGHT.—Ver. 1. **διὰ τοῦτο ἔχοντες κ.τ.λ.**: *wherefore, having this Ministration, sc.*, of the New Covenant, *even as we received mercy* (*i.e.*, "even as we were mercifully granted it," a favourite thought with St. Paul; *cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 25, 1 Tim. i. 13, 16), *we faint not; cf.* 2 Tim. i. 7, **οὐ γὰρ ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ Θεὸς πνεῦμα δειλίας**. He is still answering the question, "Who is sufficient for these things?" (ii. 16); but he, again, in the verses which follow, diverges from this main thought to answer the charge of insincerity which his opponents had brought against him. The tone of vv. 1-6 is very like that of 1 Thess. ii. 1-12, which offers several verbal parallels.

Ver. 2. **ἀλλ' ἀπειπάμεθα τὰ κρυπτὰ κ.τ.λ.**: *but we have renounced* (the "ingressive aorist"; *cf.* **ἐσίγησεν**, Acts xv. 12) *the hidden things of shame; cf.* Rom. xiii. 12, Eph. iv. 22. The stress is on **τὰ κρυπτά**; it is the openness and candour of his ministry on which he insists (*cf.* John iii. 20).—**μὴ περιπατ. κ.τ.λ.**: *not walking in craftiness* (see x. 3 and reff. above; **περιπατεῖν** = *versari*), *nor handling deceitfully* (**οὐδὲ ἐν δόλῳ**, 1 Thess. ii. 3, *cf.* chap. ii. 17) *the Word of God, sc.*, the Divine message with which we have been entrusted (*cf.* the charge brought against him and referred to in xii. 16, *viz.*, that being **πανοῦργος** he had taught the Corinthians **δόλῳ**); *but by the manifestation of the truth* (*cf.* vi. 7, vii. 14), *sc.*, by plain statement of the truths of the Gospel in public preaching, *commending ourselves* (here is our Letter of Commendation, iii. 1, and *cf.* note there) *to every man's conscience* (lit. "to every conscience of men," *i.e.*, to every possible variety of the human conscience; *cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 22) *in the sight of God*. The appeal to conscience can never be omitted with safety, and any presentation of Christianity which is neglectful of the verdict of conscience on the doctrines taught is at once un-Apostolic and un-Christlike. These verses (1-6) have been chosen as the Epistle for St. Matthew's Day, probably on account of the apparent applicability of ver. 2 to the circumstances of St. Matthew's call and his abandonment of a profession which was counted shameful. But of course **ἀπειπάμεθα** does not imply that St. Paul had ever been guilty of using crafty artifices such as he here repudiates once and for all.

γέλιον [n] ἡμῶν, ἐν τοῖς [o] ἀπολλυμένοις ἐστὶ κεκαλυμμένον· 4. ἐν οἷς ὁ
o *Cf.* chap. ii. 15.
p John xii. 40; 1 John ii. 11 only; Isa. xlii. 19.
q Reff. ii. 11.
r Here only; *cf.* Lev. xiii. 24, xiv. 56.
s Ver. 6 only; *cf.* Job iii. 9; Ps. xxvi. 1, lxxxix. 8, etc.
t Wisd. vii. 26; reff. iii. 18.
u Acts viii. 5; 1 Cor. i. 23; Phil. i. 15.

θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου [p] ἐτύφλωσε τὰ [q] νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων, εἰς
τὸ μὴ [r] αὐγάσαι [1] αὐτοῖς [2] τὸν [s] φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης
τοῦ Χριστοῦ,[3] ὅς ἐστιν [t] εἰκὼν τοῦ [t] Θεοῦ.[4] 5. οὐ γὰρ ἑαυτοὺς
[u] κηρύσσομεν, ἀλλὰ [u] Χριστὸν [5] Ἰησοῦν Κύριον· ἑαυτοὺς δὲ δούλους

[1] ℵBGKLP support **αυγασαι**; CDEH have **καταυγασαι**, and A 17 **διαυγασαι.**

[2] D[b]cEKLP and the Syriac vss. add **αυτοις** after **αυγ.**; om. ℵABCD*GH 17, d, e, f, g, r, etc.

[3] C has **κυριου** for **Χριστου.**

[4] ℵ[c]LP and the Harclean add **του αορατου** (from Col. i. 15) after **Θεου.**

[5] BHKL, the Peshitto and Bohairic support **Χρ. Ἰησ.**; ℵACDE, the Harclean, d, e, f, r, etc., give **Ἰη. Χρ. Κυ.**; G, g give **Κυ. Ἰη. Χρ.**; P has **Ἰη. Χρ.** (omitting **Κυ.**).

Ver. 3. **εἰ δὲ καὶ κ.τ.λ.**: *but even if our gospel* (*sc.*, the good news we preach; see reff.) *is veiled* (returning again to the metaphor of iii. 12-18), *it is veiled in them that are perishing; i.e.*, the fault lies with the hearers, not with the preacher (*cf.* vi. 12, and see Rom. i. 28). Blass (*Gram. of N.T. Greek*, § 41, 2) points out that **ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις** is almost equivalent to "*for* them that are perishing" (*cf.* chap. viii. 1 and 1 Cor. xiv. 11 for a like use of **ἐν**).

Ver. 4. **ἐν οἷς ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος**: *among whom the god of this world, sc.*, Satan. **αἰών** is an "age," a certain limit of time, and so **ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος** (1 Cor. i. 20, ii. 6) is "this present age," over which the devil is regarded as having power (*cf.* Eph. ii. 2, vi. 12). We have the expression **αἱ βασιλεῖαι τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου** in Ignatius (*Rom.*, 6). Wetstein quotes a Rabbinical saying, "The true God is *the first God*, but Sammael (*i.e.*, the evil angel who was counted Israel's special foe) is *the second God*". Many early writers, beginning with Origen and Irenæus, through dread of Gnostic speculations, dissociate **ὁ Θεός** from **τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου**, which they join with **τῶν ἀπίστων.** But this is a mere perversity of exegesis, suggested by controversial prejudice. Beliar is twice called "the ruler of this world" in the *Ascension of Isaiah* (ed. Charles, pp. 11, 24).—**ἐτύφλωσε τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων**: *hath blinded* (the "ingressive aorist" again; *cf.* ver. 2) *the minds* (*cf.* iii. 14) *of the unbelieving*. Out of sixteen occurrences of the word **ἄπιστος** in the Pauline Epistles, fourteen are found in the Epp. to the Corinthians; it consistently means "unbelieving," and is always applied to the *heathen*, not to the Jews (except, perhaps, Titus i. 15).—**εἰς τὸ μὴ αὐγάσαι κ.τ.λ.**: *to the end that the light* (lit. "the illumination") *of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the Image of God, should not dawn upon them.* This is the force of **αὐγάσαι,** even if, as we seemingly must do, we omit **αὐτοῖς** from our text; **αὐγή** is the "dawn," and **αὐγάσαι** is to be taken intransitively. The R.V. marginal rendering "that they should not see the light," etc., does not suit the context so well. The A.V. "the light of the glorious gospel of Christ" is inadequate, as it does not bring out the force of the phrase **τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης. δόξης** is the genitive of *contents* (*cf.* the similar phrase, 1 Tim. i. 11); the substance of the good tidings preached is the **δόξα,** the glorious revelation of Christ (*cf.* ver. 6 below). That Christ is the Image or **εἰκών** of God is the statement of St. Paul which approaches most nearly in form to the **λόγος** doctrine of St. John (see reff. and, for the general sense, 1 Cor. xi. 3, Phil. ii. 6; *cf.* Heb. i. 3). P. Ewald, who maintains that St. Paul was acquainted with a Johannine tradition of our Lord's words, finds in vv. 3, 4 reminiscences of conversations reported in the Fourth Gospel. Thus we have in consecutive verses (John viii. 44, 45) **ὑμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστὲ . . . οὐ πιστεύετέ μοι,** and the expression **ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου** is comparable with **ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου** (John xii. 31, xiv. 30, xvi. 11). The parallels are certainly interesting; *cf.* also the phrase **εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ** with John viii. 19, 42.

Ver. 5. **οὐ γὰρ ἑαυτοὺς κ.τ.λ.**: *for we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus*

ὑμῶν[1] διὰ Ἰησοῦν.[2] 6. ὅτι ὁ[3] Θεὸς ὁ εἰπὼν ἐκ σκότους φῶς λάμψαι,[4] ὃς[5] ἔλαμψεν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν, πρὸς φωτισμὸν τῆς [v] γνώσεως τῆς [w] δόξης τοῦ[6] Θεοῦ ἐν [x] προσώπῳ Ἰησοῦ[7] Χριστοῦ.

7. Ἔχομεν δὲ τὸν [x] θησαυρὸν τοῦτον ἐν [y] ὀστρακίνοις [y z] σκεύεσιν, ἵνα ἡ [a] ὑπερβολὴ τῆς δυνάμεως ᾖ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ μὴ ἐξ ἡμῶν· 8. [b] ἐν [b] παντὶ θλιβόμενοι, ἀλλ' οὐ [c] στενοχωρούμενοι· [d] ἀπορούμενοι, ἀλλ' οὐκ [e] ἐξαπορούμενοι· 9. διωκόμενοι, ἀλλ' οὐκ [f] ἐγκαταλειπόμενοι·

v *Cf.* Hab. ii. 14.
w See on i. 11.
x Col. ii. 3; *cf.* Mk. x. 21.
y 2 Tim. ii. 20; Lev. vi. 28.
z Ps. ii. 29; Acts ix. 15; Rom. ix. 21; 1 Pet. iii. 7.
a Reff. i. 8.
b Chap. vii. 5; reff. below.
c Chap. vi. 12 only; *cf.* chap. vi. 4, xii. 10, and Josh. xvii. 15; Isa. xlix. 19.
d John xiii. 22; Acts xxv. 20; Gal. iv. 20 only.
e Chap. i. 8 only.
f Rom. ix. 29 (Isa. i. 9); 2 Tim. iv. 10, 16; Heb. xiii. 5 (Josh. i. 5); Deut. iv. 31; Ps. xxxvi. 25.

[1] ℵ 17 have **ημων**, a mere blunder.

[2] **Ἰησουν** is supported by A*BDEGHKLP and the Syriac vss. (*cf.* ver. 11); ℵ*A**C 17, the Latins and Bohairic give **Ἰησου**, which does not yield so impressive a sense.

[3] B om. **ο** before **Θεος**.

[4] Better **λαμψει** with ℵ*ABD* and the Syriac vss.; **λαμψαι** is supported by the remaining uncials and the Latins.

[5] D*G and the Old Latin vss. omit **ος** before **ελαμψ**.

[6] Instead of **του Θεου** C*D*G, d, e, g, r supply **αυτου**.

[7] ℵCHKLP, the Syriac and Bohairic support **Ἰησ. Χρ.**; DEG and the Latins give **Χρ. Ἰη.**; AB 17 (followed by Tisch. and W.H.) omit **Ἰησου** (see ii. 10 above).

as Lord (*cf.* 1 Cor. xii. 3, "No man can say, Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit"), *and ourselves your slaves for Jesus' sake* (*cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 19 and chap. i. 24 above; see also xi. 20 **καταδουλοῖ**).

Ver. 6. **ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ.**: *seeing it is God who said "Light shall shine out of darkness"* (a paraphrase of Gen. i. 3; *cf.* Ps. cxii. 4), *who shined in our hearts to illuminate* (others) *with the knowledge of the glory of God in the Face of Christ.* That is to say, there is nothing secret or crafty in the Ministration of the New Covenant; it is the proclamation of a second *Fiat Lux* (St. John i. 4, viii. 12) in the hearts of men (2 Pet. i. 19). The image of iii. 18 is thus preserved in this verse; we reflect the light which shines upon us from the Divine Glory, as manifested in Christ.

Vv. 7-15. His Bodily Weakness does not annul the effects of his Ministry.—Ver. 7. **ἔχομεν δὲ τὸν θησαυρὸν κ.τ.λ.**: *but, sc.*, in contrast to the glowing and exultant phrases of ver. 6, *we have this treasure, sc.*, of "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God," *in earthen vessels.* The comparison of man, in respect of his powerlessness and littleness in God's eyes, to an earthen jar made by a potter for his own purposes and of any shape that he wills is common in the O.T. (Job x. 9, Isa. xxx. 14, Jer. xix. 11; see 2 Esdras iv. 11), and St. Paul works out the idea in Rom. ix. 20 ff. He also distinguishes here and at 2 Tim. ii. 20 between different kinds of **σκεύη**, illustrating thereby the difference between men; while he himself is elsewhere called **σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς**, and St. Peter calls woman **ἀσθενέστερον σκεῦος** (see reff.). In the present passage **σκεῦος** seems to be used specially for the human *body* (*cf.* 2 Esdras vii. [88], *vas corruptibile*), as the thought in the Apostle's mind is (mainly) of his own *physical* infirmities; the figure being derived from the ancient custom of storing gold and silver in earthenware pots. The treasure of the Gospel light is contained in an "earthen vessel," a frail body which may (seemingly) at any moment succumb (*cf.* Job iv. 19 and see v. 1 below). This may appear surprising, that so great a treasure should seem to be exposed to the mishaps which may befall the perishable jar in which it is contained; but yet (though St. Paul does not pursue this line of thought here) it is the very principle of the Incarnation that the heavenly is revealed and received through the earthly, for "the Word became flesh" (St. John i. 14). —**ἵνα ἡ ὑπερβολὴ τῆς δυνάμεως κ.τ.λ.**: *that the exceeding greatness of the power, sc.*, which triumphs over all obstacles, *may be God's and not from ourselves.* The weakness of the instru-

g Heb. vi. 1 only; 2 Kings iii. 19.
h Rom. iv. 19 only; *cf.* Col. iii. 5; Heb. xi. 12.
i Mk. vi. 55; Eph. iv. 14 only; 2 Macc. vii. 27.
k Reff. ii. 14.

g καταβαλλόμενοι, ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἀπολλύμενοι· 10. πάντοτε τὴν h νέκρωσιν τοῦ Κυρίου[1] Ἰησοῦ[2] ἐν τῷ σώματι[3] i περιφέροντες, ἵνα καὶ ἡ ζωὴ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ[4] ἐν τῷ[5] σώματι ἡμῶν k φανερωθῇ. 11. ἀεὶ[6] γὰρ ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες εἰς θάνατον παραδιδόμεθα διὰ Ἰησοῦν, ἵνα καὶ ἡ ζωὴ τοῦ

[1] KL and the Harclean give **Κυριου**, but it is not found in the best authorities and should be omitted.

[2] For **Ἰησου** D*G, d, e, f, g read **Χριστου**.

[3] DEG, the Peshitto, Bohairic and Latin vss. add **ημων** after **σωματι**.

[4] D*G, d, e, g give **Ἰησου Χριστου**.

[5] ℵ, r, vg. give **τοις σωμασιν** (adopted by Tisch.); the received text follows the bulk of the authorities; A and the Bohairic place **φανερωθη** before **εν τῳ σωματι ημων**.

[6] G, f, g and the Peshitto give **ει** for **αει**.

ment is to demonstrate the Divinity of the power which directs it (*cf.* chap. xii. 9 and 1 Cor. ii. 5).

Vv. 8, 9. **ἐν παντὶ θλιβόμενοι κ.τ.λ.**: with a sudden change of metaphor, the Apostle now thinks of himself as a soldier engaged with an apparently stronger foe, and at every moment on the point of defeat; and in four pairs of antithetical participles he describes his condition: *in every direction pressed hard, but not hemmed in; bewildered, but not utterly despairing; pursued, but not forsaken* (*i.e.*, abandoned to the pursuing foe); *struck down* (as by an arrow; *cf.* Xen., *Cyr.*, i., 3, 14 for this use of **καταβάλλειν**), *but not destroyed*. The general sense is much like that of Prov. xxiv. 16, Mic. vii. 8; *cf.* also chap. xi. 23-30. **στενοχωρία** is nearly always (in N.T.) coupled with **θλῖψις** (*cf.* Rom. ii. 9, viii. 35, chap. vi. 4, and Isa. viii. 22, xxx. 6). With the play on words **ἀπορούμενοι . . . ἐξαπορούμενοι**, which it is difficult to reproduce in English, see on i. 13 above. The phrase **ἐν παντί** occurs no less than nine times again in this Epistle (see chap. vi. 4, vii. 5, 11, 16, viii. 7, ix. 8, 11, xi. 6, 9), though only once elsewhere (1 Cor. i. 5) in St. Paul's writings.

Vv. 10, 11. The climax of the preceding antithesis is now reached: "Dying, yet living" (*cf.* vi. 9). **πάντοτε τὴν νέκρωσιν κ.τ.λ.**: *always bearing about in the body the dying of Jesus, that the Life also of Jesus may be manifested in our body; for we which live are ever being delivered over to death* (*cf.* xi. 23 below) *for Jesus' sake, that the Life also of Jesus may be manifested in our mortal flesh.* The key to the interpretation of ver. 10 is to observe that ver. 11 is the explanation of it (**ἀεὶ γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**); the two verses are strictly parallel: "our mortal flesh" of ver. 11 is only a more emphatic and literal way of describing "our body" of ver. 10. Hence the bearing about of the **νέκρωσις** of Jesus must be identical with the continual deliverance to death for His sake. Now the form **νέκρωσις** (see reff.) is descriptive of the process of "mortification"; and the **νέκρωσις τοῦ Ἰησοῦ** must mean the **νέκρωσις** to which He was subject while on earth (*gen. subjecti*). The phrase **περιφέρειν τὴν νέκρωσιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ** conveys, then, an idea comparable to that involved in other Pauline phrases, *e.g.*, "to die daily" (1 Cor. xv. 31), "to be killed all the day long" (Rom. viii. 36, a quotation from Ps. xliii. 22), "to know the fellowship of His sufferings, becoming conformed unto His death" (Phil. iii. 10), "to fill up that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh" (Col. i. 24), the conception of the intimate union in suffering between Christ and the Christian having been already touched on in i. 5. And such union in suffering involves a present manifestation in us of the Life of Christ, as well as ultimate union with Him in glory (Rom. viii. 17, *cf.* John xiv. 19). The phrases "if we have become united with Him by the likeness of His death, we shall be also by the likeness of His resurrection," and "if we died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with Him" (Rom. vi. 5, 8), though verbally similar, are not really parallel to the verse before us, for *they* speak of a death to sin in baptism, while *this* has reference to actual bodily suffering in the flesh. And the inspiring thought of vv. 10, 11

Ἰησοῦ [1] φανερωθῇ ἐν τῇ [1] θνητῇ σαρκὶ ἡμῶν. 12. ὥστε ὁ μὲν [2] θάνατος ἐν ἡμῖν ἐνεργεῖται, ἡ δὲ ζωὴ ἐν ὑμῖν. 13. ἔχοντες δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον, [m] "Ἐπίστευσα, διὸ ἐλάλησα," [3] καὶ ἡμεῖς πιστεύομεν, διὸ καὶ λαλοῦμεν· 14. εἰδότες [n] ὅτι ὁ ἐγείρας τὸν Κύριον [4] Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἡμᾶς διὰ [5] Ἰησοῦ ἐγερεῖ, καὶ [o] παραστήσει σὺν ὑμῖν. 15. τὰ γὰρ πάντα δι' ὑμᾶς, ἵνα ἡ χάρις [p] πλεονάσασα διὰ [q] τῶν [q] πλειόνων τὴν [r] εὐχαριστίαν [s] περισσεύσῃ εἰς

1 Rom. vi. 12, viii. 11; 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54; chap. v. 4 only.
m Ps. cxv. 1.
n Reff. i. g.
o Rom. xiv. 10; chap. xi. 2; Eph. v. 27; Col. i. 22; *cf.* Jude 24.
p Rom. v. 20; chap. viii. 15; Phil. iv. 17; 1 Thess. iii. 12, etc.
q Reff. ii. 6.
r Acts xxiv. 3; 1 Cor. xiv. 16; chap. ix. 11, 12; Phil. iv. 6; 2 Macc. ii. 27.
s Chap. ix. 8; 1 Thess. iii. 12; Eph. i. 8.

[1] C has **Χριστου**; D*G, d, e, g **Ἰησου Χριστου.**

[2] KL and the Harclean give **μεν,** but it is omitted by the best uncials and vss.

[3] ℵG and the Syriac vss. have **διο και ελαλησα**; om. **και** (with LXX) BCDEKLP and the Latins.

[4] B 17, 1 om. **κυριον,** but it is attested by overwhelmingly preponderating authority.

[5] ℵcDcKL and the Syriac vss. support **δια Ἰησου**; better **συν** with ℵ*BCDEGP, the Latins and Bohairic.

of the present chapter is that Union with Christ, unto death, in life, has as its joyful consequence Union with Christ, unto life, in death. It is the paradox of the Gospel over again, **ὁ ἀπολέσας τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ εὑρήσει αὐτήν** (Matt. x. 39). It will be observed that the best MSS. give in ver. 10 **τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.** It is worth noticing that while in the Gospels the proper name **Ἰησοῦς** *generally* takes the article, in the Epistles it is generally anarthrous. In addition to the example before us, the only other passage where St. Paul writes **ὁ Ἰησοῦς** is Eph. iv. 21 (*cf.* Blass, *Gram. of N.T. Greek*, § 46. 10).

Ver. 12. The manifestation of Christ's Life in the Apostle's daily **νέκρωσις** is thus visible to the world and especially to his converts.—**ὥστε ὁ μὲν θάνατος κ.τ.λ.**: *so then Death worketh in us* (see on i. 6), *but Life in you, i.e.*, the Risen Life of Christ, the source of present grace as of future glory. It is this latter aspect of **ζωή**, *viz.*, as the life after death, to which his thoughts now turn.

Ver. 13. **ἔχοντες δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ πν. κ.τ.λ.**: *but, sc.*, despite our bodily weakness and the "working of death in us" of ver. 12, *having the same spirit of faith, sc.*, as the Psalmist, *according to that which is written, "I believed, and therefore I spoke," we also believe, and therefore also we speak, sc.*, as the Psalmist did. The exact meaning of Ps. cxv. 1 in the original is hard to fix; but the context would not naturally suggest the beautiful thought here read into it. That faith must find expression, that it cannot be silent, is the Apostle's adaptation of the words. With **τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως** *cf.* Rom. viii. 15, 1 Cor. iv. 21, Gal. vi. 1, Eph. i. 17, 2 Tim. i. 7, etc. Deissmann (*Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 78) illustrates the introductory formula of citation here employed by the legal formula **κατὰ τὰ προγεγραμμένα** which occurs in a Fayyûm papyrus of 52 A.D.

Ver. 14. Despite the contrast between *death* in us and *life* in you (ver. 12), we trust that we too shall share in that Risen Life of Christ. **εἰδότες ὅτι κ.τ.λ.**: *knowing that He who raised up the Lord Jesus* (see reff.) *shall raise up us also with Jesus, sc.*, on the Day of the general Resurrection (1 Thess. iv. 14), *and shall present us with you* (see reff.). Observe that the A.V. "shall raise up us also *by* Jesus" depends on a wrong reading, and perverts the sense. It would appear from this passage that the Apostle did not hope to be alive at the Second Advent of Christ (*cf.* i. 8, 1 Cor. xv. 52), although at an earlier period he seems to have cherished such an expectation (1 Thess. iv. 15).

Ver. 15. **τὰ γὰρ πάντα δι' ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ.**: (With you, I say) *for all things* (*cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 22) *are for your sakes* (*cf.* i. 6), *that the grace, being multiplied, sc.*, to me, *through the* (prayers of the) *greater number of you, may cause the thanksgiving to abound unto the glory of God. Cf.* i. 11, a closely parallel passage, and Phil. i. 19. Except that we have deemed it necessary to translate **τῶν πλειόνων** literally (see on

τὴν [t]δόξαν τοῦ [t]Θεοῦ. 16. διὸ οὐκ [u]ἐγκακοῦμεν[1]· ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ ὁ
ἔξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος [v]διαφθείρεται, ἀλλ' ὁ ἔσωθεν[2] [w]ἀνακαινοῦται
ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἡμέρᾳ. 17. τὸ γὰρ [x]παραυτίκα [y]ἐλαφρὸν[3] τῆς [z]θλίψεως
ἡμῶν[4] καθ' [a]ὑπερβολὴν εἰς[5] ὑπερβολὴν αἰώνιον [b]βάρος δόξης
τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα· τὰ γὰρ βλεπόμενα [e]πρόσκαιρα,[7] τὰ δὲ μὴ βλεπό-

t Rom. xv. 7; 1 Cor. x. 31; Phil. ii. 11; *cf.* chap. viii. 19.
u Reff. ver. 1.
v Lk. xii. 33; 1 Tim. vi. 5.
w Col. iii. 10 only; *cf.* Rom. xii. 2; Tit. iii. 5; Heb. vi. 6.
x Here only; Ps. lxix. 4; Tobit iv. 14.
y Matt. xi. 30 only; Exod. xviii. 26; *cf.* chap. i. 17.
z Reff. i. 4.
a Reff. i. 8.
b Gal. vi. 2; 1 Thess. ii. 6.
c Chap. v. 5, vii. 10, 11, ix. 11, xii. 12, etc.
d Rom. xvi. 17; Gal. vi. 1; Phil. ii. 4, iii. 17.
e Matt. xiii. 21; Mk. iv. 17; Heb. xi. 25 only; *cf.* 1 Thess. ii. 17.

[1] See crit. note on iv. 1.

[2] DbcEKL support **ο εσωθεν**; better **ο εσω ημων** with ℵBCD*GP.

[3] D*EG, the Latins and Peshitto have **προσκαιρον και ελαφρον.**

[4] BC² and the Peshitto omit **ημων.**

[5] ℵ*C*K, the Bohairic and Harclean omit **εις υπερβολην.**

[6] D*G, d, e, g have **σκοπουντες** (an anacolouthon) for **σκοπουντων ημων.**

[7] G, g, r give **προσκαιρα εστιν.**

ii. 6), the above is the rendering of the R.V. The A.V. "that the abundant grace might through the thanksgiving of many redound to the glory of God" can hardly be possible, and the position of **πλεονάσασα** in the sentence seems to require that the words be connected as in R.V. For the transitive significance of **περισσεύω** see reff.

Vv. 16-18. He is sustained by a Glorious Hope.—Ver. 16. **διὸ οὐκ ἐγκακοῦμεν κ.τ.λ.**: *wherefore, sc.*, because of the thought in ver. 14, *we faint not* (repeated from ver. 1); *but even though our outward man is decaying, yet our inward man is being renewed day by day.* That is, even though (note **εἰ καί** with the indicative as introducing not a mere contingency, but a matter of fact; see reff. ver. 3) the "earthen vessel" (ver. 7) of my body is subject to a continual **νέκρωσις** (ver. 10) and decay, yet my true self is daily renewed by Divine grace; it is in hope of the consummation of this "renewal" that I faint not (*cf.* Isa. xl. 30). The contrast between **ὁ ἔξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος** and **ὁ ἔσω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος** has verbal parallels in Rom. vii. 22, Eph. iv. 22, 23, Col. iii. 9 (*cf.* also 1 Pet. iii. 4), but they are not quite apposite, as in those passages the thought is of the difference between the lower and higher nature, the "flesh" and the "spirit," whereas here the decay of the bodily organism is set over against the growth in grace of the man himself; *cf.* the expression of Plato, **ὁ ἐντὸς ἄνθρωπος** (*Republ.*, ix., p. 589). The phrase **ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἡμέρᾳ** is a Hebraism; it is not found in this exact form in the LXX, but it might well be a rendering of יוֹם וְיוֹם (*cf.* Gen. xxxix. 10, Ps. lxviii. 19, Esther iii. 4).

Ver. 17. **τὸ γὰρ παραυτίκα κ.τ.λ.**: *for our present light burden of affliction worketh out for us more and more exceedingly an eternal heavy burden of glory; cf.*, for the thought (ever full of consolation to the troubled heart), Ps. xxx. 5, Isa. liv. 7, Matt. v. 11, Heb. xii. 11, 1 Pet. i. 6, v. 10, and especially Rom. viii. 18. **παραυτίκα** does not refer (as the A.V. and R.V. would suggest) to the brief duration of temporal affliction, but only to its being present with us *now*, as set over against the *future* glory (see reff.). **τὸ ἐλαφρὸν τῆς θλίψεως** offers a good instance of "the most classical idiom in the language of the N.T." (Blass)—especially frequent in St. Paul—according to which a neuter singular adjective is used as if it were an abstract noun; *cf.* chap. viii. 8, Rom. viii. 3, 1 Cor. i. 25, Phil. iii. 8, etc., for a like construction. **καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολήν** is another Hebraism (see last verse), מְאֹד מְאֹד ="exceedingly"; it cannot qualify **βάρος** (as the A.V. takes it) or **αἰώνιον**, but must go with **κατεργάζεται**, as above (*cf.* Gal. i. 13). Stanley points out that the collocation **βάρος δόξης** may be suggested by the fact that the Hebrew כָּבֵד means both "to be heavy" (Gen. xviii. 20, Job vi. 3) and "to be glorious" (Job xiv.

μενα αἰώνια. V. 1. οἴδαμεν γὰρ, ὅτι ἐὰν ἡ [a]ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία [a] John iii. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 40; Phil. ii. 10, iii. 19; Jas. iii. 15 only. [b] Ver. 4 only; Wisd. ix. 15 only. [c] Matt. xxiv. 2; Mk. xiv. 58; Acts vi. 14; Gal. ii. 18, etc. [d] Mk. xiv. 58; Col. ii. 11 only; *cf.* Acts xvii. 24. [e] Rom. viii. 23. [f] Jude 6 only. [g] Ver. 4 only; *cf.* John xxi. 7. [h] Rom. i. 11; chap. ix. 14; Phil. i. 8, ii. 26; 1 Thess. iii. 6; 2 Tim. i. 4.

τοῦ [b]σκήνους [c]καταλυθῇ, οἰκοδομὴν[1] ἐκ Θεοῦ ἔχομεν, οἰκίαν [d]ἀχειροποίητον, αἰώνιον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. 2. καὶ γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ [e]στενάζομεν, τὸ [f]οἰκητήριον ἡμῶν τὸ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ [g]ἐπενδύσασθαι [h]ἐπιποθοῦντες·

[1] DEG, d, e, f, g have **οτι οικοδομην.**

21); *cf.* the ambiguity in the Latin *gravitas*.

Ver. 18. **μὴ σκοπούντων ἡμῶν τὰ βλεπόμενα κ.τ.λ.**: *while we look not at the things which are seen* (*cf.* chap. v. 7), *but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal*, *sc.*, for the moment, *but the things which are not seen are eternal*, *sc.*, for the ages; *cf.* Rom. viii. 24, Heb. xi. 1. Wetstein quotes a good parallel to this splendid sentence from Seneca (Ep. 59): "Ista imaginaria sunt, et ad tempus aliquam faciem ferunt. Nihil horum stabile nec solidum est . . . mittamus animum ad ea, quae aeterna sunt."

CHAPTER V.—Vv. 1-5. HIS EXPECTATION OF A GLORIFIED BODY HEREAFTER; AND HIS DESIRE TO SURVIVE UNTIL THE SECOND ADVENT.—Ver. 1. **οἴδαμεν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**: *for* (in explanation of iv. 17) *we know*, *sc.*, we Christians (*cf.* Rom. vii. 14, 1 Cor. viii. 1), *that if our earthly* (**ἐπίγειος** as contrasted with **ἐπουράνιος**; see reff.) *tabernacle-house be dissolved*, etc. Despite the fact that he was himself a **σκηνοποιός** (Acts xviii. 3), this is the only place where St. Paul employs any of the terms correlative to **σκηνή**. It is natural to think of the temporary character of the **σκῆναι** used by the Chosen People in the desert wanderings, an idea which is probably present in 2 Pet. i. 14, **ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματός μου**; but the use of **σκῆνος** as a depreciatory term for the "bodily frame" (R.V. mg.) is borrowed, as Field has shown, from the Pythagorean philosophy. It is the "tenement house," the "earthen vessel" (see iv. 7), and is called in Wisd. ix. 15, **τὸ γεῶδες σκῆνος. καταλύειν** (see reff.) is often used of the "destruction" of a house; and the application of the word "dissolution" for death is probably derived from this passage.—**οἰκοδομὴν ἐκ Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ.**: *we have* (*i.e.*, at the very moment of bodily dissolution, when the Resurrection takes place, according to the Apostle's thought here; see Charles' *Eschatology*, pp. 395, 400) *a building from God*, *sc.*, not built up by the natural processes of growth but the direct gift of God, *a house not made with hands* (this being added to emphasise its "supernatural" character; the **σκῆνος** of the natural body is *also*, of course, **ἀχειροποίητον**, and so the idea is not as fitly in place as at Heb. ix. 11, 24, but it is suggested by the word **οἰκία**. It is just possible that his own trade of tent-making may have been in his mind at the moment), *eternal*, *in the heavens*. *Cf.* Luke xvi. 9, **αἰωνίους σκηνάς**; as he has just said (iv. 18) **τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα αἰωνία**. It will be observed that here **αἰωνίος** is used with the special intention of emphasising the *permanent* character of the heavenly house, in contrast with the earthly house which is dissolved; it is therefore not accurate to say (as is sometimes said) that **αἰωνίος** *never* connotes length of time, although it is true that in St. John it is a "qualitative" rather than a "quantitative" term.

Vv. 2, 3 and ver. 4 form two parallel sentences, both introduced by **καὶ γάρ**, of which either may be used to elucidate the other. Both bring out the Apostle's shrinking from death, *i.e.*, the act of dying, and his half-expressed anxiety that he may survive until the Day of Christ (*cf.* 1 Thess. iv. 15).

Ver. 2. **καὶ γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ κ.τ.λ.**: *for indeed in this*, *sc.*, in this tabernacle (*cf.* ver. 3), *we groan*, *sc.*, being weighed down by the body, *longing to be clothed upon*, *i.e.*, to have the heavenly body put on in addition, like an outer garment over our mortal flesh, *with our habitation which is from heaven*, *sc.*, which is brought thence by the Lord at His Coming (*cf.* 1 Thess. iv. 16, Rev. xxi. 2, and *Ascension of Isaiah* (ed. Charles), iv. 16, ix. 17). The verb **ἐπιποθεῖν** always expresses in St. Paul a yearning for home; here it is used of the heavenly home-sickness of the saints.

Ver. 3. **εἴ γε καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι κ.τ.λ.**: *if so be that* (**εἴ γε** = *siquidem*; *cf.* Eph. iii. 2, iv. 21, Col. i. 23) *we shall be found*

i 1 Cor. xv. 54, etc.
k Reff. i. 8.
l Here only in Paul.
m Reff. ii. 7.
n Reff. iv. 11.
o Reff. i. 22.
p Ver. 8; chaps. vii. 16, x. 1, 2; Heb. xiii. 6 only.
q Vv. 8, 9 only; *cf.* viii. 19.
r Chap. xii. 2, 3; Heb. xiii. 3.

3. εἴ[1] γε καὶ [1]ἐνδυσάμενοι[2] οὐ γυμνοὶ εὑρεθησόμεθα. 4. καὶ γὰρ οἱ ὄντες ἐν τῷ σκήνει[3] στενάζομεν [k]βαρούμενοι,[4] ἐπειδὴ[5] οὐ θέλομεν [l]ἐκδύσασθαι, ἀλλ' [m]ἐπενδύσασθαι, ἵνα [n]καταποθῇ τὸ [n]θνητὸν[6] ὑπὸ τῆς ζωῆς. 5. ὁ δὲ κατεργασάμενος[7] ἡμᾶς εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο Θεὸς,[8] ὁ καὶ[9] δοὺς ἡμῖν τὸν [o]ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ [o]Πνεύματος. 6. [p]θαρροῦντες οὖν πάντοτε, καὶ εἰδότες ὅτι [q]ἐνδημοῦντες[10] [r]ἐν τῷ [r]σώματι [q]ἐκδημοῦμεν ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου· 7. διὰ γὰρ πίστεως περιπατοῦμεν, οὐ διὰ εἴδους· 8. θαρροῦμεν δὲ καὶ εὐδοκοῦμεν μᾶλλον ἐκδημῆσαι ἐκ τοῦ σώματος καὶ ἐνδημῆσαι πρὸς τὸν Κύριον. 9. διὸ καὶ φιλοτιμούμεθα, εἴτε ἐνδημοῦντες εἴτε ἐκδημοῦντες, εὐάρεστοι αὐτῷ εἶναι. 10. τοὺς γὰρ πάντας ἡμᾶς φανερωθῆναι δεῖ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα κομίσηται ἕκαστος τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος πρὸς ἃ ἔπραξεν, εἴτε ἀγαθὸν εἴτε φαῦλον.

[1] ℵCKLP support ει γε; BDEG 17 have ειπερ.

[2] D*, d, e, g have εκδυσαμενοι; G εκλυσαμενοι.

[3] DEG, d, e, f, g, the Syriac and Bohairic vss. give σκηνει τουτῳ.

[4] D*G have βαρυνομενοι.

[5] επειδη is found in a few cursives only; the uncials give εφ' ᾧ.

[6] G, g and the Bohairic have θνητον τουτο.

[7] DEG, d, e, f, g, m κατεργαζομενος. [8] ℵ* has ο Θεος.

[9] ℵcDbcEKL and the Harclean insert και before δους; the better authorities omit it.

[10] D*G have επιδημουντες.

also clothed, *sc.*, with the heavenly body (note **ἐνδυσ.**, not **ἐπενδυσ.**, which would only be appropriate of the body to be "superindued" in the case of one surviving to the Second Advent), *not naked*, *sc.*, disembodied spirits at the Day of His Appearing, a condition from the thought of which he shrinks. **γυμνός** was commonly used in this sense in Greek philosophy; Alford quotes Plato, *Cratyl.*, p. 277*c*., **ἡ ψυχὴ γυμνὴ τοῦ σώματος** (see 1 Cor. xv. 37); *cf.* also Philo *de Hum.*, 4, **τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπογυμνουμένης.**

Ver. 4. **καὶ γὰρ οἱ ὄντες κ.τ.λ.**: *for indeed we who are in the body* (see ver. 1) *groan*, *being burdened* (*cf.* Wisd. ix. 15, **φθαρτὸν σῶμα βαρύνει ψυχήν**), *not for that* (**ἐφ' ᾧ**; *cf.* Rom. v. 12) *we would be unclothed* (*cf.* 2 Esdras ii. 45) *but clothed upon*, *that what is mortal may be swallowed up of life*, *i.e.*, that the mortal body may, without passing through death, be absorbed, as it were, in the heavenly body which is to be superindued (*cf.* Isa. xxv. 8). The double metaphor in these verses from that of a *house* to that of a *garment* is quite in St. Paul's manner. Stanley finds the explanation of both "in the image which both from his occupation and his birthplace would naturally occur to the Apostle, the tent of Cilician haircloth, which might almost equally suggest the idea of a habitation and of a vesture" (*cf.* Ps. civ. 2). The truth is that no single metaphor could possibly convey to the mind a true conception of heaven or of the condition of the blessed. We may speak of the heavenly home as a *place* (**οἰκητήριον**), but we have to remind ourselves that it is rather a *state* here expressed by the image of heavenly vesture.

Ver. 5. **ὁ δὲ κατεργασάμενος κ.τ.λ.**: *now He that worked us up for this very thing*, *sc.*, the change from mortality to life, *is God* (*cf.* iv. 6 and especially i. 21 for the form of the sentence), *who gave to us the earnest of the Spirit*; *cf.* Rom. viii. 11. The "Holy Spirit of promise" is "an earnest of our inheritance" (Eph. i. 14; see above on i. 22).

Some theologians, *e.g.*, Martensen, take a somewhat different view of vv. 1-5, and interpret them as implying St. Paul's belief in a body of the intermediate state between death and judgment, distinct at once from the "earthly tabernacle" and the "heavenly house," which latter will be "superindued" at the Second Advent. But (*a*) there is no hint elsewhere in the N.T. of such an *ad interim* body; (*b*) the "house" which "we have" at death is described in ver. 1 not as temporary, but as "eternal". This it is which enables him to face death with courage; he would shrink from any **γυμνότης** or disembodied condition, and—so far as the "body" is concerned—he does not contemplate any further change at the Day of Judgment. If it might be so, he is reverently anxious to live until the Parousia, and then to be "superindued"; but even if he is to pass through the gate of death he is content. See Salmond's *Christian Doctr. of Immortality*, p. 565 ff.

μοῦμεν[1] ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου[2]· 7. διὰ πίστεως γὰρ [s]περιπατοῦμεν, οὐ διὰ [t]εἴδους· 8. θαρροῦμεν[4] δὲ, καὶ [u]εὐδοκοῦμεν μᾶλλον ἐκδημῆσαι ἐκ[5] τοῦ σώματος, καὶ ἐνδημῆσαι πρὸς τὸν Κύριον.[6]

9. Διὸ καὶ [v]φιλοτιμούμεθα, εἴτε[7] ἐνδημοῦντες, εἴτε ἐκδημοῦντες, [w]εὐάρεστοι αὐτῷ εἶναι. 10. τοὺς γὰρ πάντας ἡμᾶς [x]φανερωθῆναι δεῖ [y]ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ [z]βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα [a]κομίσηται ἕκαστος τὰ[8] διὰ[9] τοῦ σώματος, πρὸς ἃ ἔπραξεν, εἴτε ἀγαθὸν, εἴτε κακόν.[10]

s Reff. iv. 2.
t Lk. iii. 22, ix. 29; John v. 37; 1 Thess. v. 22 only; Exod. xxiv. 17.
u Rom. xv. 26, 27; chap. xii. 10; 1 Thess. ii. 8, iii. 1; 2 Thess. ii. 12.
v Rom. xv. 20; 1 Thess. iv. 11 only.
w Rom. xii. 1, xiv. 18; Eph. v. 10; Phil. iv. 18; Col. iii. 20; Wisd. iv. 10, ix. 10.
x Reff. ii. 14.
y Matt. x. 32, xxv. 32; Lk. xxi. 36; Acts xviii. 17; 1 Thess. i. 3, ii. 19, iii. 9, 13.
z Matt. xxvii. 19; Acts xviii. 12, xxv. 6; Rom. xiv. 10, etc.
a Eph. vi. 8; Col. iii. 25; 2 Macc. viii. 33.

[1] DEG have **αποδημουμεν**.

[2] D*G, d, e, g and the Bohairic give **Θεου** for **Κυριου**.

[3] G, f, g have **και ου δια**.

[4] ℵ 17 have **θαρρουντες**.

[5] ℵ* om. **εκ**.

[6] D* 17 have **Θεον** for **Κυριον**.

[7] The Peshitto and f, g give the order **ειτε εκδ. ειτε ενδ.**

[8] D*G have **α δια του σωματος επραξεν**.

[9] The Latin vss. (*propria corporis*) testify to a variant **ιδια** for **δια**.

[10] BDEGKLP have **κακον**; ℵC 17 have **φαυλον** (probably an early correction introduced from Rom. ix. 11; it is, however, adopted by Tisch. and W.H.).

Vv. 6-8. In any case to be with Christ is best.—Ver. 6. **θαρροῦντες οὖν κ.τ.λ.**: *being therefore, sc.*, on account of "the earnest of the Spirit" (ver. 5), *always, sc.*, in any event, whether we die before the Day of Christ or survive to see it in the flesh, *of good courage, and knowing that whilst we are at home in the body* (see reff.) *we are absent from the Lord, sc.*, from Christ, our true home. The O.T. phrase that man is a sojourner only (**παρεπίδημος**) on the earth (Ps. xxxviii. 13; *cf.* Heb. xi. 13) is verbally comparable with this **ἐνδημοῦντες . . . ἐκδημοῦμεν**; but the idea here is rather that of the *body* as the temporary habitation of the man's self (*cf.* ver. 1). We are citizens of earth, but our true **πολίτευμα** is **ἐν οὐρανοῖς** (Phil. iii. 20).

Ver. 7. **διὰ πίστεως γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**: *for we walk by faith* (*cf.* John xx. 29, and chap. iv. 18), *i.e.*, in a state of faith (see note on **διά** with the gen. of attendant circumstances ii. 4), *not by appearance* (**εἴδος**, as the reff. show, must be thus translated = *quod aspicitur*; but nevertheless the rendering of A.V. and R.V. "not by sight," though verbally inexact, conveys the sense. *Cf.* Heb. xi. 1, **ἔστιν δὲ πίστις . . . πραγμάτων ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων**, and 1 Cor. xiii. 12). The verse is parenthetical and explanatory of the sense in which we are "absent from the Lord".

Ver. 8. **θαρροῦμεν δὲ κ.τ.λ.**: *nay* (the **δέ** is resumptive of the thought in ver. 6, which has been interrupted by ver. 7, the grammatical structure involving an anacoluthon), *we are of good courage* (for this is demanded even of the most faithful by the prospect of death) *and are well-pleased* (see reff. for cases where **εὐδοκεῖν** is used of men, not of God) *rather to be away from the home of the body and to be at home with the Lord* (*cf.* John i. 1 for such a use of **πρός**). Even if we must die before the Second Advent, we would say, we are content, for this absence from the body will be presence with Christ (*cf.* Luke xxiii. 43, Phil. i. 21-23), though the glory of that Presence shall not be fully manifested until the Day of the Parousia.

Vv. 9, 10. We must remember the Judgment to come.—Ver. 9. **διὸ καὶ φιλοτιμούμεθα κ.τ.λ.**: *wherefore also we make it our ambition* (see reff.), *whether at home or away from home, sc.*, whether at His coming He finds us "in the body" or "out of the body," *to be well pleasing to Him; cf.* Rom. xiv. 8, Phil. i. 20, 1 Thess. v. 10.

Ver. 10. **τοὺς γὰρ πάντας κ.τ.λ.**: *for* (explanatory of the reason of our desire to be "well-pleasing" to Him) *we all* (**τοὺς πάντας** is emphatic, not only Paul who has been speaking of himself as **ἡμεῖς**, but "all of us" *quick* as well as

11. εἰδότες οὖν τὸν [b] φόβον τοῦ [b] Κυρίου, ἀνθρώπους πείθομεν, Θεῷ δὲ πεφανερώμεθα· ἐλπίζω δὲ καὶ ἐν ταῖς [c] συνειδήσεσιν ὑμῶν πεφανερῶσθαι. 12. οὐ γὰρ[1] πάλιν [d] ἑαυτοὺς [d] συνιστάνομεν ὑμῖν, ἀλλὰ [e] ἀφορμὴν διδόντες ἡμῖν[2] καυχήματος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν,[3] ἵνα ἔχητε

b Acts ix. 31; *cf.* Gen. xxxv. 5; chap. vii. 1 and Eph. v. 21.
c Reff. i. 12.
d Reff. iii. 1.
e Rom. vii. 8, 11; chap. xi. 12; Gal. v. 13; 1 Tim. v. 14 only; Prov. ix. 9; 3 Macc. iii. 2.

[1] $D^{c}EKL$ support γαρ; om. all vss. and ℵBCD*G.

[2] B*, d, e support διδοντες ημιν; better υμιν with all other authorities.

[3] ℵB 17 have (wrongly) υμων; ημων all other authorities.

dead) *must be made manifest.* The A.V. "appear" weakens the force of the word; the Day of Judgment is to be a day when men's characters shall be made patent to the world, and to themselves, as they have always been to God; *cf.* Mark iv. 22, Rom. ii. 16, xiv. 10, 1 Cor. iv. 5, Rev. xx. 12.—**ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήμ. κ.τ.λ.**: *before the judgment-seat of Christ.* In the N.T. (see reff.) **βῆμα** is always used (except in the quotation Acts vii. 5) of the official seat of a judge, although twice in the LXX (Neh. viii. 4, 2 Macc. xiii. 26), as generally in classical Greek, it stands for the pulpit from which a formal speech is made.—**ἵνα κομίσηται ἕκαστος κ.τ.λ.**: *that each one may receive, i.e.*, obtain the wages of (see reff.), *the things done through the medium of the body* (*cf.* Plato's phrase **αἰσθήσεις αἱ διὰ τοῦ σώματος,** cited by Meyer; there is no need to identify **διὰ τοῦ σώματος** with **ἐν τῷ σώματι** of ver. 6 as the A.V. and R.V. do) *according to what he did, sc.*, in this present life (note the aorist and *cf.* Luke xii. 47), *whether it be good or bad* (*cf.*, for this constr. of **εἴτε . . . εἴτε,** Eph. vi. 8, Phil. i. 18). Similar expressions are used of a future judgment, at, *e.g.*, Ps. lxi. 13, Prov. xxiv. 12, Jer. xvii. 10, xxxii. 19 (*cf.* Job xxxiv. 11?) in the O.T., and in the N.T. at Rom. ii. 6, xiv. 12, 1 Pet. i. 17, in all of which passages the power of judgment is ascribed to the Eternal Father. But He "hath given all judgment unto the Son" (John v. 22), and thus Christ is repeatedly spoken of as the future Judge of men, *e.g.*, Matt. xvi. 27, Acts xvii. 31, Rev. ii. 23, xxii. 12, and esp. Matt. xxv. 31-46. *Cf.* Luke xxi. 36, **σταθῆναι ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.** And so (from the present verse) the variant **Χριστοῦ** has crept into the parallel passage, Rom. xiv. 10, **πάντες γὰρ παραστησόμεθα τῷ βήματι τοῦ Θεοῦ.** A reference to the O.T. parallels makes it tolerably plain that the statement that men will be judged according to their works is a broad and general one, and that to find a difficulty, as the Fathers did, in the case of the death of infants (whether baptised or unbaptised), who are incapable of self-conscious and voluntary actions, is quite perverse.

Vv. 11-13. REITERATION OF HIS SINCERITY OF PURPOSE.—Ver. 11. **εἰδότες οὖν τὸν φόβον κ.τ.λ.**: *knowing, therefore, sc.*, because of the conviction expressed in ver. 10, *the fear of the Lord, sc.*, as Judge (*cf.* Heb. x. 31), *we persuade men, sc.*, of our sincerity, *but we have been* (already) *made manifest to God*, as we shall be at the Day of Judgment (see ver. 10). To regard **πείθομεν** (*cf.* Acts xii. 20, Gal. i. 10) as referring to a "persuading" of the truths of Christianity is to depart from the context. He is now returning to the question at iii. 1, and he has explained the motives of his ministry and the obligations to sincerity of speech which bind him. We should expect (in classical Greek) **ἀνθρώπους μὲν πείθ. κ.τ.λ.**, but the omission of **μέν** does not destroy, though it obscures, the antithesis. It would be out of place to speak of "persuading" God of our sincerity; to Him we are "made manifest" whether we will or no.—**ἐλπίζω δὲ κ.τ.λ.**: *and I hope* (as we say, "I trust") *we have been made manifest also in your consciences;* see iv. 2 for a similar appeal.

Ver. 12. **οὐ γὰρ πάλιν κ.τ.λ.**: *we are not again* (see iii. 1, and the note there; he takes up this theme again after a long digression) *commending ourselves to you, but* [write these things] *as giving you occasion of glorying on our behalf.* We must understand in the latter clause some such words as **γράφομεν ταῦτα**: there are similar *anacolutha* at vii. 5, viii. 18.—**ἵνα ἔχητε πρὸς τοὺς κ.τ.λ.**: *that ye may have it, sc.*, some **καύχημα** or matter of glorying, *against those who glory in outward appearance and not in heart, sc.*, against his opponents at Corinth.

πρὸς τοὺς ἐν [f]προσώπῳ καυχωμένους, καὶ οὐ[1] [f]καρδίᾳ.[2] 13. εἴτε [f] *Cf.* 1 Thess. ii. 17 and on chap. i. 11.
γὰρ [g]ἐξέστημεν, Θεῷ· εἴτε [h]σωφρονοῦμεν, ὑμῖν. 14. ἡ γὰρ [i]ἀγάπη [g] Here only in Paul; *cf.* Mk. iii. 21.
τοῦ [i]Χριστοῦ[3] [k]συνέχει ἡμᾶς, 15. [l]κρίναντας τοῦτο, ὅτι εἰ[4] εἷς ὑπὲρ [h] Rom. xii. 3; Tit. ii. 6.
πάντων ἀπέθανεν, ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον· καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέ-
θανεν,[5] ἵνα οἱ ζῶντες μηκέτι ἑαυτοῖς ζῶσιν, ἀλλὰ τῷ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν

[i] Rom. viii. 35; Eph. iii. 19. [k] Phil. i. 23 only in Paul; *cf.* Lk. viii. 37, xii. 50; Acts xviii. 5. [l] *Cf.* Acts xv. 19.

[1] CD^{c}EKLP have **ου** (D*G have **ουκ**); better **μη** with ℵB 17.

[2] CD^{c}EKLP give **καρδιᾳ**; better **εν καρδ.** with ℵBD*G 17.

[3] CP 17 and the Harclean have **Θεου** for **Χριστου.**

[4] ℵ^{c}C*, f and the Bohairic insert **ει**; om. ℵ*BC^{2}DEGKLP, d, e, g and the Syriac vss. (it may have been dropped through inadvertence before **εις**).

[5] G, f, g, etc. give **απεθανεν Χριστος.**

The phrase **προσώπῳ οὐ καρδίᾳ** occurs in 1 Thess. ii. 17 in the sense of **πνεύματι οὐ σώματι** (*cf.* 1 Cor. v. 3, Col. ii. 5); but a better parallel for the present passage is 1 Sam. xvi. 7, where Samuel is told that while *man* looks **εἰς πρόσωπον**, *God* looks **εἰς καρδίαν.** So St. Paul here refers to teachers who lay stress on the outward appearance and the "face" (see note i. 11) of things, such as a man's enthusiasms and visions (xii. 1 and ver. 13), or his eloquence (chap. x. 10), or his letters of commendation (iii. 1), or his Jewish birth (xi. 22), or his personal intimacy in the flesh with Christ (ver. 16) —rather than on the inward motive and "heart" of his message.

Ver. 13. **εἴτε γὰρ ἐξέστημεν κ.τ.λ.**: *for whether* (see on i. 6 for constr.) *we are beside ourselves, it is unto God; or whether we are of sober mind, it is unto you* (note the *dat. commodi*). At a later period Festus told Paul that he was mad (Acts xxvi. 24), so impressed was he with the Apostle's enthusiasm; and it is probable that the anti-Pauline party at Corinth were not slow to point to the "visions and revelations of the Lord" which St. Paul claimed for himself (chap. xii. 1-6), and to the facility with which he spoke "with tongues" (1 Cor. xiv. 18), as proofs of his madness. A similar accusation was made against his Master (Mark iii. 21). But St. Paul bids them (ver. 12) look a little deeper, and not judge by mere outward phenomena such as these. He repeatedly asks them to bear with his seeming foolishness (chap. xi. 1, 16, 17, xii. 6, 11). It is possible that a charge of a contrary nature had been also made by his opponents, and that his regard for other men's prejudices (1 Cor. ix. 20), and the "craftiness" with which he caught the Corinthians "with guile" (chap. xii. 16), were urged as savouring more of worldly wisdom than of true piety. His answer to both charges is contained in this verse. If he has exceeded the bounds of moderation, it is in his moods of highest devotion, when he is pouring out his soul to God and not to man; if he has exercised a sober prudence in his dealings with his converts, it is all for their sakes, and not for selfish ends.

Vv. 14-16. IT IS NOT THE KNOWLEDGE OF CHRIST IN HIS EARTHLY LIFE, BUT THE LOVE WHICH CHRIST HAS FOR MAN THAT IS THE CONSTRAINING POWER OF PAUL'S PREACHING.—Ver. 14. **ἡ γὰρ ἀγάπη τοῦ Χρ. κ.τ.λ.**: *for the Love of Christ constraineth us, sc.*, within the limits laid down in ver. 13. The words are often quoted as meaning that the love which Christians bear to Christ is the supreme motive of the Christian life; but however true this is in itself, it is not the meaning of the Apostle here. The genitive of the person after **ἀγάπη** is in St. Paul's Epistles always *subjective* (*cf.* **ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ**, Rom. v. 5, viii. 39, chap. xiii. 13, 2 Thess. iii. 5, and *cf.* also Rom. xv. 30, Eph. ii. 4, Col. i. 13, and for **ἡ ἀγ. τοῦ Χρ.** reff. above); *i.e.*, "the Love of God" and "the Love of Christ" signify with him the love which God and Christ bear towards (**εἰς**) man. (St. Paul often uses the verb **ἀγαπάω** to express man's love to God, but never the substantive **ἀγάπη**). St. John's usage varies, the genitive sometimes being *objective* and sometimes *subjective* (*cf.* John v. 42 and 1 John ii. 5, 15, iii. 17, iv. 9, v. 3;

m Ps. cxii. 2; Lk. i. 48; John viii. 11; Acts xviii. 6. n Reff. i. 17.

ἀποθανόντι καὶ ἐγερθέντι. 16. ὥστε ἡμεῖς [m]ἀπὸ [m]τοῦ [m]νῦν οὐδένα οἴδαμεν [n]κατὰ [n]σάρκα· εἰ δὲ[1] καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν κατὰ[2] σάρκα Χριστὸν,

[1] The best supported reading is **ει και** ℵ*BD* 17; G, the Latins and the Peshitto have **και ει**; ℵ[c]C[2]D[bc]EKL and the Harclean **ει δε και**; K and the Bohairic **ει δε**.

[2] DE, d, e and the Bohairic have **Χρ. κατα σαρκα.**

see also Luke xi. 42), but St. Paul's is not doubtful. The "Love of Christ" here, then, is the love which Christ has for us, not the love which we bear to Him; the constraining power of Christian ministration and service is more effective and stable than it would be if it sprang from the fickle and variable affections of men (*cf.* John xv. 16).

Ver. 15. **κρίναντας τοῦτο ὅτι εἷς κ.τ.λ.**: *judging this; that One died for all* (*cf.* Rom. v. 15), *therefore all died, and He died for all, that they who live* (see iii. 11) *should no longer live unto themselves, but unto Him who died and rose again for them.* To die **ὑπὲρ τῶν φίλων αὐτοῦ** is the greatest proof that anyone can offer of his love (John xv. 13). The proof to us of the Love of Christ to all is that He died **ὑπὲρ πάντων.** Of this Death two consequences are now mentioned: (*a*) one objective and inevitable, quite independent of our faith and obedience; (*b*) another subjective and conditional. (*a*) **ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον,** *then all died, sc.*, in Him who is the "recapitulation" of all humanity, Jew and Greek, bond and free, faithless or believing. We must not weaken the force of **οἱ πάντες**: the Incarnation embraces all men (*cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 22). The A.V. "then were all dead" (the same mistranslation occurs Rom. vi. 2, Col. iii. 3) does not bring out the sense, which is that the Dying of Christ on the Cross was in some sort the dying of all mankind. But (*b*) the purposes of the Atonement are not completely fulfilled without the response of man's faith and obedience; *He died for all,* **ἵνα οἱ ζῶντες κ.τ.λ.** This is the frequent exhortation of St. Paul (Rom. vi. 11 and see 1 Pet. iii. 18); the purpose of Christ's Death is to lead us to Life, a life "unto God" (*cf.* Rom. vi. 11, xiv. 7, 8)—the "life indeed" (1 Tim. vi. 19) which must be begun here if it is to be perfected hereafter. The preposition **ὑπέρ,** "on behalf of" (*cf.* chap. xii. 10), employed in these verses is the one usually employed in the N.T. to express the relation between Christ's Atoning Death and our benefit: it was "for our sake," "on our behalf" (*e.g.*, Luke xxii. 19, 20, John x. 15, xi. 51, Rom. v. 6, 1 Cor. i. 13, Gal. iii. 13, Eph. v. 2, Heb. ii. 9, 1 John iii. 16). It is not equivalent to **ἀντί,** "instead of" (although in Philemon 13 its meaning approximates thereto), and ought not to be so translated; although the preposition **ἀντί** is used of our Lord's Atoning Work in three places (Matt. xx. 28, Mark x. 45, 1 Tim. ii. 6), and the implied metaphor must have a place in any complete theory of the Atonement. But here **ὑπέρ** is (as usual) used, and the rendering "instead of," even if linguistically possible (which it is not), is excluded by the fact that in the phrase **ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀποθανόντι καὶ ἐγερθέντι, ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν** is governed by *both* participles. Christ rose again "on our behalf"; He is never said to have risen "instead of us".

Ver. 16. **ὥστε ἡμεῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν κ.τ.λ.**: *so that, sc.*, because of our conviction, that we should not live unto ourselves but unto Christ (ver. 15), *we, sc.*, Paul as contrasted with his opponents at Corinth, *from henceforth, sc.*, this conviction having mastered us, *know no man after the flesh, i.e.*, are quite indifferent as to his mere external qualifications as a preacher of the Gospel, his eloquence, Jewish birth, etc.: we are not like those who glory **ἐν προσώπῳ** and not **ἐν καρδίᾳ** (ver. 12); *cf.* Gal. ii. 6.—**εἰ καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν κ.τ.λ.**: *even though we have known* (the distinction between **οἴδαμεν** and **ἐγνώκαμεν** is hardly to be pressed) *Christ after the flesh, i.e.*, though there was a time in my life when I, like my Judaising opponents now, laid great stress on the local and hereditary, and, so to speak, fleshly "notes" of the Messiah who was to come, *yet now we know Him so no more, i.e.*, I know better now, for I have learnt since my conversion that the national Messiah of the Jews is Himself the Incarnate Word, to whom every race of men is alike related, for He is the Christ of the Catholic Church of God. In per-

ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκ ἔτι γινώσκομεν.[1] 17. ὥστε εἴ τις °ἐν °Χριστῷ, [p]καινὴ [p]κτίσις· τὰ [q]ἀρχαῖα [r]παρῆλθεν, ἰδοὺ γέγονε καινὰ τὰ[2] πάντα.

o Rom. xvi. 7; chap. xii. 2; Gal. i. 22; 1 Pet. v. 14; *cf.* Rom. viii. 1; 1 Cor. i. 30; Eph. ii. 10, 13. p Gal. vi. 15 and see below. q Here only in Paul. r Here only in Paul.

[1] DEG, d, e, g add κατα σαρκα (to clear up the sense) after γινωσκ.

[2] D^{bc}EKLP and the Harclean support καινα τα παντα; the stronger combination, ℵBCD*G, the Latins and the Bohairic, omit τα παντα.

sonal religion the merely *historical* must yield precedence to the *mystical* element; it is of great interest and of real value to learn all that can be known about the Birth, Life, Death and Resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth, but it is the *present* Life of Christ, "in whom" we may be found if we will, that is of religious import, as is further explained in ver. 17. This "is the same feeling which appears in the fact . . . that no authentic or even pretended likeness of Christ should have been handed down from the first century; that the very site of His dwelling place at Capernaum should have been entirely obliterated from human memory; that the very notion of seeking for relics of His life and death, though afterwards so abundant, first began in the age of Constantine. It is the same feeling which, in the Gospel narratives themselves, is expressed in the almost entire absence of precision as to time and place" (Stanley). Beyschlag and others (see Knowling, *Witness of the Epistles*, p. 2) conclude from the words εἰ καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν κατὰ σάρκα Χριστόν that St. Paul had seen, and possibly heard, Jesus during His public ministry at Jerusalem (*cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 1); on this interpretation the words would be introduced at this point to indicate that, however much stress the other Apostles and their adherents might lay on such outward knowledge, yet to St. Paul, though he could lay claim to it as well as they, this did not seem the essential matter. But (*a*) the words do not necessarily imply this; it is noteworthy that he says Χριστόν, not Ἰησοῦν, which we should expect on Beyschlag's hypothesis. (*b*) The explanation given above is quite in accordance with the usage of κατὰ σάρκα with a verb (see reff.), and the order of the words here and in the preceding clause does not allow us to take κατὰ σάρκα with οὐδένα in the one case and with Χριστόν in the other. (*c*) As Schmiedel points out, if St. Paul really had had personal experience of the public ministry of Jesus, he would hardly have failed to mention it in the great apologetic passage, chap. xi. 22-33. Other writers, *e.g.*, Jowett, explain the latter clause of this verse by supposing that the Apostle is contrasting his more mature preaching with his preaching at an earlier stage of his Christian ministry when he had not yet emancipated himself from Jewish prejudices. But of his consciousness of such a "development" in his views, subsequently to his conversion, there is no trace in the Epistles. The contrast is really between Saul the Pharisee and Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles.

Vv. 17-19. In Christ all is new, as from God who reconciled the world to Himself in Christ.—Ver. 17. ὥστε εἴ τις κ.τ.λ.: *so that* (a consequence of the higher view of Christ explained in the last verse) *if any man* (note the universality of the doctrine which he expounds) *be in Christ, there is a new creation.* To be ἐν Χριστῷ is a very different thing from claiming to be Χριστοῦ "of Christ," *sc.*, of the Christ-party (1 Cor. i. 12, chap. x. 7); this indeed is exactly the distinction which St. Paul has had in mind in the last verse. The expression "a new creation" was a common Rabbinical description of a converted proselyte (see Wetstein *in loc.*); but its meaning was enriched in the religion of the Incarnation (*cf.* John iii. 3, Rom. vi. 4, Eph. ii. 10, iv. 23, Col. iii. 10, etc.). The Vulgate "si qua ergo in Christo nova creatura," which takes τις with κτίσις, is plainly a mistake.—τὰ ἀρχαῖα παρῆλθεν κ.τ.λ.: *the old things have passed away; behold, they are become new, sc.*, not only the ancient customs of Jewish ritual observance, but the old ways of conceiving of the Messiah who was to come; more generally, the old thoughts of God and of sin and salvation have received fresh colouring—they are "become new" (*cf.* Heb. viii. 13). The words of Isa. xliii. 18, 19 offer a close verbal parallel: τὰ ἀρχαῖα μὴ συλλογίζεσθε· ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ποιῶ καινὰ (*cf.* Isa. lxv. 17, Rev. xxi. 4, 5), but the parallel is rather in words than in sense.

s Rom. xi. 36; 1 Cor. viii. 6, xi. 12.
t Rom. v. 10; 1 Cor. vii. 11, and vv. 19, 20 only; Jer. xxxi. 39 (LXX); 2 Macc. i. 5, vii. 33, viii. 29; *cf.* Eph. ii. 16; Col. i. 20, 21.
u Rom. v. 11, xi. 15, 19 only; Isa. ix. 5; 2 Macc. v. 20.
v Chap. xi. 21; 2 Thess. ii. 2 only.
w Matt. vi. 14; Rom. iv. 25, etc.

18. τὰ δὲ [s]πάντα [s]ἐκ τοῦ[1] [s]Θεοῦ, τοῦ [t]καταλλάξαντος ἡμᾶς ἑαυτῷ διὰ [2]Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ δόντος ἡμῖν τὴν διακονίαν τῆς [u]καταλλαγῆς· 19. [v]ὡς [v]ὅτι Θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ, μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ [w]παραπτώματα αὐτῶν, καὶ θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν

[1] D*G om. τον.

[2] DcEKL support Ἰησ. Χρ.; ℵBCD*GP and the vss. om. Ἰησου.

The thought of the new interpretation of life offered in the Incarnation carries us a step beyond the prophets of the Old Covenant. St. Paul's words show how completely he regarded "the Death of Christ as a new epoch in the history of the human race. Had he foreseen distinctly that a new era would be dated from that time; that a new society, philosophy, literature, moral code, would grow up from it over continents of which he knew not the existence; he could not have more strongly expressed his sense of the greatness of the event than in what is here said" (Stanley).

Ver. 18. **τὰ δὲ πάντα κ.τ.λ.**: *but all things, sc.*, all these new things, *are of God*. See reff. St. Paul is especially anxious in this Epistle to trace up spiritual blessings to their true source; see chap. i. 21, iv. 6, v. 5, and *cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 23, **ὑμεῖς δὲ Χριστοῦ, Χριστὸς δὲ Θεοῦ.**—**τοῦ καταλλάξαντος κ.τ.λ.**: *who reconciled* (note the aorist) *us, sc.*, all mankind, *to Himself through Christ*. The words **καταλλάσσω, καταλλαγή** should be studied (see reff.) in all the contexts where they occur. The verb signifies (i.) *to exchange* and (ii.) *to reconcile, i.e.*, to re-establish friendly relations between two parties who are estranged, no matter on which side the antagonism exists. Thus in Matt. v. 24 it is the brother who has *given* offence (not he who has *received* it) that is spoken of as "being reconciled" to the other (*cf.* also 1 Sam. xxix. 4). And so too St. Paul's usage is to speak of man being reconciled to God, not of God being reconciled to man; but far too much has been made of this distinction. In fact, in 2 Macc. (see reff.) the usage is the other way, for God is *there* always spoken of as "being reconciled" to His servants. It is, no doubt, more reverent in such a matter to keep as close to the language of the N.T. as we can, and to speak nakedly of God "being reconciled" to man might readily suggest false and unworthy views as to the Supreme. But that St. Paul would have felt any difficulty in such a phrase is very unlikely. The important point to observe in the present passage is that it is God Himself who is the ultimate Author of this Reconciliation; *cf.* Rom. v. 8, viii. 31, 32, and especially John iii. 16. That the Reconciliation is "through Christ" is the heart of the Gospel of the Atonement (*cf.* Rom. iii. 24, Col. i. 20, etc.).—**καὶ δόντος ἡμῖν κ.τ.λ.**: *and gave to us, sc.*, to me, Paul (he is not now thinking of others), *the Ministry of Reconciliation; cf.* chap. iii. 9, **ἡ διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης,** the genitive in both cases being, of course, of the thing ministered.

Ver. 19. **ὡς ὅτι Θεὸς ἦν κ.τ.λ.**: *viz., that God was reconciling the world, sc.*, the whole human race (*cf.* Rom. iv. 13, xi. 12, and note the absence of the article), *to Himself in Christ* (*cf.* Gal. ii. 17). The pleonastic **ὡς ὅτι** is not classical, but it is found in late authors (see reff.). The A.V., "God was in Christ, reconciling," etc., is not accurate; **ἦν** goes with both **καταλλάσσων** and **θέμενος, ἦν** with a participle being more emphatic than a simple imperfect (*cf.* Luke iv. 44). If we take **ἦν** with **ἐν Χριστῷ,** we should have to treat **θέμενος κ.τ.λ.** as a parallel clause to **λογιζόμενος κ.τ.λ.,** which it is not.—**μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς κ.τ.λ.**: *not reckoning unto them their trespasses*, a parenthetical sentence explanatory of **καταλλάσσων**; *cf.* Rom. iv. 8 (Ps. xxxii. 2).—**καὶ θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν κ.τ.λ.**: *and had placed in our hands* (*cf.* 1 Thess. v. 9, 1 Tim. i. 12; the verb is specially used of the Divine purposes) *the Word of Reconciliation, i.e.*, the Divine Message which speaks of reconciliation to God; *cf.* Acts xiii. 26, **ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης,** 1 Cor. i. 18, **ὁ λόγος τοῦ σταυροῦ,** Phil. ii. 16, **λόγος ζωῆς,** etc.

Vv. 20-vi. 3. As Christ's Ambassador he entreats the Corinthians to be Reconciled to God.—Ver. 20. **ὑπὲρ**

τὸν[1] λόγον τῆς καταλλαγῆς. 20. [x]ὑπὲρ[2] Χριστοῦ οὖν [y]πρεσβεύομεν, [x] Eph. v. 20; Phil. i. 29.
ὡς τοῦ Θεοῦ παρακαλοῦντος δι' ἡμῶν· [z]δεόμεθα[3] [x]ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, [y] Eph. vi. 20 only.
καταλλάγητε[4] τῷ Θεῷ· 21. τὸν γὰρ[5] μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ [z] Rom. i. 10; chaps. viii. 4, x. 2; Gal. iv. 12; 1 Thess. iii. 10.
ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς γινώμεθα[6] [a]δικαιοσύνη [a]Θεοῦ

[a] Rom. i. 17, iii. 5, 21, 22, x. 3; Jas. i. 20; 2 Pet. i. 1 only.

[1] D*EG, g have (του) ευαγγελιου τον λογον.

[2] D*G, d, e, g have ον υπερ Χρ. for υπερ Χρ. ουν.

[3] D*G, d, e, g have δεομενοι.

[4] D*G, d, e, g and the Harclean margin give καταλλαγηναι.

[5] ℵ[c]DcEKLP and the Syriac vss. insert γαρ; better om. γαρ with ℵ*BCD*G 17, the Latins and Bohairic.

[6] Only a few minuscules give γινωμεθα; all the uncials have γενωμεθα.

Χριστοῦ οὖν πρεσβεύομεν κ.τ.λ.: *we are ambassadors therefore, sc.*, because to us has been committed the Ministry of Reconciliation, *on behalf of Christ*, as Christ's representative (see on ver. 15 above for the force of **ὑπέρ**), *as though God were entreating by us* (*cf.* vi. 1 and see on i. 4). The construction of **ὡς** followed by a genitive absolute is found also at 1 Cor. iv. 18, 2 Pet. i. 3.—**δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ Χρ. κ.τ.λ.**: *we beseech you on behalf of Christ, Be ye reconciled to God.* The imperative **καταλλάγητε** is much more emphatic than the infinitive **καταλλαγῆναι** (see crit. note) would be; all through we perceive the Apostle's anxiety that the Corinthians should turn from the sin which beset them, whatever it might be in any individual case (*cf.* ii. 16, iv. 1, vi. 1, xi. 3). Note that the appeal, "Be ye reconciled to God," is based on the fact (ver. 18) that God has already "reconciled us to Himself through Jesus Christ".

Ver. 21. The very purpose of the Atonement was that men should turn from sin.—**τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν κ.τ.λ.**: *Him who knew no sin* (observe **μή** rather than **οὐ**, as it is not so much the bare fact of Christ's sinlessness that is emphasised, as God's knowledge of this fact, which rendered Christ a possible Mediator) *He made to be sin on our behalf.* Two points are especially deserving of attention here: (i.) That any man should be sinless (*cf.* Eccl. viii. 5) was an idea quite alien to Jewish thought and belief; and therefore the emphasis given to it by St. Paul, and the absolutely unqualified way in which it is laid down in a letter addressed to a community containing not only friends but foes who would eagerly fasten on any doubtful statement, show that it must have been regarded as axiomatic among Christians at the early date when this Epistle was written. The claim involved in the challenge of Christ, **τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐλέγχει με περὶ ἁμαρτίας** (John viii. 46), had never been disproved, and the Apostolic age held that He was **χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας . . . ἀμίαντος, κεχωρισμένος ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν** (Heb. iv. 15, vii. 26), and that **ἁμαρτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν** (1 John iii. 5; *cf.* St. Peter's application of Isa. liii. 9 at 1 Pet. ii. 22). That He was a moral Miracle was certainly part of the primitive Gospel. (ii.) The statement **ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν** is best understood if we recall the Jewish ritual on the Day of Atonement, when the priest was directed to "place" the sins of the people upon the head of the scapegoat (Lev. xvi. 21). **ἁμαρτία** cannot be translated "sin-offering" (as at Lev. iv. 8, 21, 24, 34, v. 9-12), for it cannot have two different meanings in the same clause; and further it is contrasted with **δικαιοσύνη**, it means "sin" in the abstract. The penalties of sin were laid on Christ **ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν**, "on our behalf," and thus as the Representative of the world's sin it becomes possible to predicate of Him the strange expression **ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν** (**ποιέω** being used here as at John v. 18, viii. 53, x. 33). The nearest parallel in the N.T. is **γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα** (Gal. iii. 13); *cf.* also Isa. liii. 6, Rom. viii. 3, 1 Pet. ii. 24.—**ἵνα ἡμεῖς γενώμεθα κ.τ.λ.**: *that we might become, sc.*, as we have become (note the force of the aorist), *the righteousness of God in Him* (*cf.* Jer. xxiii. 6, 1 Cor. i. 30, Phil. iii. 9, and reff.). "Such we are in the sight of God the Father, as is the very Son of God Himself. Let it be counted folly or frenzy or

ἐν αὐτῷ. VI. 1. [a]Συνεργοῦντες δὲ καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν[1] μὴ [b]εἰς [b]κενὸν τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ δέξασθαι ὑμᾶς[2]· 2. (λέγει[3] γάρ, "Καιρῷ [c]δεκτῷ [d]ἐπήκουσά σου, καὶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ σωτηρίας [e]ἐβοήθησά σοι·" ἰδοὺ νῦν καιρὸς [f]εὐπρόσδεκτος, ἰδοὺ νῦν ἡμέρα σωτηρίας·) 3. μηδεμίαν [g]ἐν [g]μηδενὶ διδόντες [h]προσκοπήν, ἵνα μὴ [i]μωμηθῇ ἡ διακονία[4]·

a Mk. xvi. 20; Rom. viii. 28; 1 Cor. xvi. 16; Jas. ii. 22 only. b Gal. ii. 2; Phil. ii. 16; 1 Thess. iii. 5 only; Isa. lxv. 23. c Lk. iv. 19, 24; Acts x. 35; Phil. iv. 18 (Isa. lvi. 7) only. d Here only; *cf.* Ps. xix. 2. e Here only in Paul; *cf.* Acts xvi. 9, xxi. 28. f Rom. xv. 16, 31; chap. viii. 12; 1 Pet. ii. 5 only. g Chap. vii. 9; Phil. i. 28. h Here only; *cf.* Rom. xiv. 13; 1 Cor. viii. 9. i Chap. viii. 20 only; Prov. ix. 7; Wisd. x. 14 only; *cf.* 2 Pet. ii. 13.

[1] D*E*G, d, e, g give παρακαλουντες.

[2] D* om. υμας; ℵ*C 17 have ημας. [3] D*G, d, e, g give καιρῳ γαρ λεγει.

[4] DEG 73, the Latin, Sahidic and Syriac vss. add ημων after διακ.

fury or whatsoever. It is our wisdom and our comfort; we care for no knowledge in the world but this, that man hath sinned and God hath suffered; that God hath made Himself the sin of men, and that men are made the righteousness of God" (Hooker, *Serm.*, ii., 6).

CHAPTER VI.—Ver. 1. **συνεργοῦντες δὲ καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν κ.τ.λ.**: *and working together* (that is, with God, as is plain from chap. v. 20, and also in connexion with 1 Cor. iii. 9; *cf.* Acts xv. 4), *we*, *sc.*, I, Paul, *entreat also* (*cf.* chap. v. 20, **Θεοῦ παρακαλοῦντος δι' ἡμῶν**) *that ye receive not the grace of God* (a general phrase, frequently used by St. Paul to express the favours and privileges offered to the members of the Church of Christ, not to be limited to grace given at any special moment, as, *e.g.*, at baptism) *in vain* (see reff. and *cf.* Heb. xii. 15). Note that "the grace of God" *may* be "received" in vain; it is offered, independently of man's faith and obedience, but it will not profit without these. The choice in the Anglican Liturgy of vv. 1-10 as the Epistle for the First Sunday in Lent, when the Ember Collect is said on behalf of those to be ordained in the next week, is especially happy; the magnificent description of the characteristics and the conditions of a faithful Christian ministry (vv. 4-10) being prefaced by the solemn warning of vv. 1-3.

Ver. 2. **λέγει γάρ, Καιρῷ δεκτῷ κ.τ.λ.**: *for He*, *sc.*, God, *saith* (*cf.* Rom. ix. 15, Gal. iii. 16), "*At an acceptable time I hearkened to thee, and in a day of salvation did I succour thee*" (Isa. xlix. 8). The whole verse is parenthetical, and is introduced to remind the Corinthians that the present dispensation is that dispensation of grace of which the prophet speaks; Stanley pointed out that **δέξασθαι** of ver. 1 may well have suggested **δεκτός**, which in its turn suggested the quotation. The words in their original context are addressed by Jehovah to His Servant, while St. Paul takes them as addressed by God to His people; but, inasmuch as the Servant in the latter portion of Isaiah is the Representative of Israel, the application made by the Apostle is easily explicable.—**ἰδοὺ νῦν καιρὸς εὐπρόσδεκτος κ.τ.λ.**: *behold now is the "Acceptable Time," behold now is the "Day of Salvation"*. This is St. Paul's comment. Observe that he does not say **σήμερον** (*cf.* Heb. iii. 7 ff.), but **νῦν**—not "to-day," but "the present dispensation". His point here is *not* (as it is often represented) that the only day of grace which we can reckon on is the present (gravely true though this is), but that the Christian dispensation is the one spoken of by the O.T. prophet in familiar words. It will be remembered that Christ applied to Himself and His ministry in like manner the words of Isa. lxi. 2, **καλέσαι ἐνιαυτὸν Κυρίου δεκτόν** (Luke iv. 19). We are not to draw any distinction here between **δεκτός** and **εὐπρόσδεκτος**; the latter is the usual word in secular authors, and (see reff.) is always used by St. Paul, except (Phil. iv. 18) in a quotation from the LXX.

Ver. 3. **μηδεμίαν ἐν μηδενὶ κ.τ.λ.**: *giving no occasion of stumbling* (see reff.; Alford aptly quotes Polybius, xxvii., 6, 10, **διδόναι ἀφορμὰς προσκοπῆς**) *in anything, that our ministration be not blamed*. The clause is parallel with ver. 1, **διδόντες** corresponding to **συνεργοῦντες**, both being descriptive of the way in which **παρακαλοῦμεν**, etc.; *cf.*, for like sentiments, 1 Cor. viii. 13, ix. 12, 22, x. 33. We have **μηδεμίαν . . . μηδενί** rather than **οὐδεμίαν . . . οὐδενί**, as it is the thought or intention of the preacher which is the point to be brought out.

4. ἀλλ' [k] ἐν [k] παντὶ [l] συνιστῶντες [1] [l] ἑαυτοὺς ὡς [m] Θεοῦ [m] διάκονοι, [2] ἐν [n] ὑπομονῇ πολλῇ, ἐν [o] θλίψεσιν, ἐν [p] ἀνάγκαις, ἐν [q] στενοχωρίαις, 5. ἐν [r] πληγαῖς, ἐν [r] φυλακαῖς, ἐν [s] ἀκαταστασίαις, ἐν [t] κόποις, ἐν [u] ἀγρυπνίαις, ἐν [v] νηστείαις, 6. ἐν [w] ἁγνότητι, ἐν γνώσει, ἐν [x] μακροθυμίᾳ, ἐν [y] χρηστότητι, ἐν [z] πνεύματι [z] ἁγίῳ, ἐν ἀγάπῃ [a] ἀνυποκρίτῳ,

k See on iv. 8.
l Reff. iv. 2.
m Rom. xiii. 4; 1 Thess. iii. 2.
n Reff. i. 6.
o Reff. i. 4.
p 1 Cor. vii. 26; chap. xii. 10; 1 Sam. xxii. 2.
q Rom. ii. 9, viii. 35; chap. xii. 10; *cf.* chap. iv. 8.
r Acts xvi. 23; chap. xi. 23; *cf.* Heb. xi. 36.
s Lk. xxi. 9; 1 Cor. xiv. 33; chap. xii. 20; Jas. iii. 16 only; Prov. xxvi. 28; Tobit iv. 13.
t 1 Cor. iii. 8; chaps. x. 15, xi. 23, 27; 1 Thess. i. 3, iii. 5.
u Chap. xi. 27 only; 2 Macc. ii. 26.
v Lk. ii. 37; Acts xiv. 23, xxvii. 9; chap. xi. 27 only; Dan. ix. 3.
w Chap. xi. 3 only.
x Gal. v. 22; Eph. iv. 2; Col. i. 11, iii. 12; 2 Tim. iii. 10, iv. 2.
y Gal. v. 22; Col. iii. 12.
z *Cf.* Rom. xv. 19; 1 Thess. i. 5.
a Rom. xii. 9; 1 Tim. i. 5; 2 Tim. i. 5; 1 Pet. i. 22; Jas. iii. 17 only; Wisd. v. 18, xviii. 16 only.

[1] ℵ[c]DcEKL give **συνιστωντες**; Tisch. reads **συνισταντες** with ℵ*CD*G 17; W.H. read **συνισταvοντες** with BP (*cf.* iii. 1).

[2] D* has **διακονους**; also f, g, vg.

Vv. 4-10. The Conditions and the Characteristics of his Apostolic Ministry. We have in this noble description of his service a characteristic outburst of impassioned eloquence on a topic in which the Apostle felt an intense personal interest. But its fervour has not been permitted to interfere with the careful choice of words: the balanced antitheses, the rhythmical cadences and assonances, which abound throughout, betray the literary training of the writer, and recall at once such passages as Rom. viii. 31-39, 1 Cor. xiii. 1-13. Indeed many of the phrases which follow suggest an acquaintance with the Stoic paradoxes expressive of the **αὐτάρκεια** of the ideal sage. Compare also chap. xi. 22-28, where he recounts in more detail the trials of his Apostolic ministry.

Ver. 4. **ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ συνιστάντες κ.τ.λ.**: *but in everything* (the details being given in the following verses) *commending ourselves* (see note on iii. 1) *as God's ministers do.* We now come to the description of the conditions under which and the means by which God's minister commends himself to those to whom his message is addressed. The description naturally divides itself into four sections: he commends himself (i.) in outward hardships, vv. 4[b], 5, (ii.) in inward graces, vv. 6, 7[a], (iii.) by the armour of righteousness, whether he be well or evil spoken of, vv. 7[b], 8[ab], (iv.) having indeed a character the reverse of that ascribed to him by his opponents, vv. 8[c]-10.

(i.) The general description here is **ἐν ὑπομονῇ πολλῇ**: *in much patience* (see note on i. 6 and *cf.* xii. 12); and this is further amplified and explained in the three triplets which follow. (*a*) **ἐν θλίψεσιν, ἐν ἀνάγκαις, ἐν στενοχωρίαις**: *in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses* (see reff. and *cf.* Acts ix. 16), *i.e.*, such trials as sickness (see i. 6, xii. 7), or loss of friends (2 Tim. iv. 10), or perplexity (iv. 8, where see note), or any of the thousand chances (as we call them) of a troubled and anxious life. "The prevailing idea is that of pressure and confinement: each stage narrower than the one before, so that no room is left for movement or escape" (Stanley).

Ver. 5. (*b*) These outward hardships are next more definitely exemplified from the opposition and persecution which St. Paul encountered from opponents during his missionary experiences. **ἐν πληγαῖς, ἐν φυλακαῖς, ἐν ἀκαταστασίαις**: *in stripes* (see reff. and *cf.* Acts xxii. 24), *in imprisonments* (see on xi. 23), *in tumults* (*cf.* Acts xiii. 50, xiv. 5, 19, xvi. 22, xvii. 5, xviii. 12, xix. 29, xxi. 30). **ἀκαταστασία** might mean *inward disorder*, rather than *external tumult* (see reff., LXX, and *cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 11), but the latter meaning best suits the context here. (*c*) Next the Apostle enumerates the bodily hardships, voluntarily undertaken, which his work made it necessary to endure.—**ἐν κόποις, ἐν ἀγρυπνίαις, ἐν νηστείαις**: *in labours*, *sc.*, probably his labours in preaching the Gospel (see reff., but *cf.* 1 Thess. ii. 9, 2 Thess. iii. 8, where **κόπος** is used of the manual labour he underwent in working for a livelihood; see also 1 Cor. iv. 11 **ἀστατοῦμεν καὶ κοπιῶμεν**), *in watchings*, *sc.*, in nights rendered wakeful by anxiety or press of work (Acts xx. 31) or urgency of prayer (Acts xvi. 25 and *cf.* Eph. vi. 18 **ἀγρυπνοῦντες**), *in fastings.* Some expositors explain these **νηστεῖαι** as the voluntary fastings of religion (so Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.*, v., lxxii., 8; and *cf.* Acts xiii.

7. ἐν [b]λόγῳ [b]ἀληθείας, ἐν [c]δυνάμει [c]Θεοῦ, διὰ τῶν [d]ὅπλων τῆς [d]δικαιοσύνης τῶν [e]δεξιῶν καὶ [e]ἀριστερῶν, 8. διὰ δόξης καὶ [f]ἀτιμίας, διὰ [g]δυσφημίας καὶ [g]εὐφημίας· ὡς [h]πλάνοι, καὶ ἀληθεῖς· 9. ὡς [i]ἀγνοούμενοι, καὶ [k]ἐπιγινωσκόμενοι· ὡς ἀποθνήσκοντες, καὶ ἰδοὺ

b Eph. i. 13; Col. i. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 15. c Rom. i. 16; 1 Cor. i. 18, 24, ii. 5; chap. xiii. 4; 2 Tim. i. 8; 1 Pet. i. 5. d Rom. vi. 13; *cf.* Rom. xiii. 12; chap. x. 4. e 1 Chr. xii. 2. f Chap. xi. 21, etc. g Here only. h 1 Tim. iv. 1; *cf.* 2 Tim. iii. 13. i Gal. i. 22. k Reff. i. 13.

2, 3). And it is true that **νηστεία** (see reff.) and **νηστεύω** are *always* (outside this Epistle) used of fasting as a devotional observance. But in the parallel passage xi. 27 **νηστείαι** is clearly used of involuntary abstinences from food; and this meaning seems better to suit the context here also (*cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 11, Phil. iv. 12) (§ 23). The triplet (*c*), then, means "in toil, in sleeplessness, in hunger".

Vv. 6, 7. (ii.) The inward gifts and qualities by the display of which the Christian minister commends himself are now enumerated. (*a*) We have, first, four graces, each described by a single word: **ἐν ἁγνότητι, ἐν γνώσει, ἐν μακροθυμίᾳ, ἐν χρηστότητι**: *in pureness, sc.*, not only chastity, but purity of intention and thought in general (*cf.* chap. vii. 11, Jas. iii. 17, 1 John iii. 3), *in knowledge, sc.*, of Divine things (the **λόγος γνώσεως** is one of the gifts of the Spirit, 1 Cor. xii. 8), *in long-suffering* (a grace specially needful for a Christian missionary; in Rom. ii. 4, ix. 22, 1 Tim. i. 16, St. Paul speaks of God's **μακροθυμία**, but generally he applies it to man; see Prov. xxv. 15), *in kindness* (see reff.; it is a *Divine* attribute in Rom. ii. 4, xi. 22, Eph. ii. 7, Tit. iii. 4; *cf.* Matt. xi. 30).—(*b*) We have next four qualifications, each described in two words: **ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἀνυποκρίτῳ, ἐν λόγῳ ἀληθείας, ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ**: *in the Holy Spirit* (this ought to stand at the head of the list, but the order in which the various graces are mentioned is determined rather by sound and rhythm than by strictly logical considerations), *in love unfeigned, sc.*, love to man, not love to God (see note on chap. v. 14 and *cf.* **ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος**, Rom. xii. 9), *in the Word of Truth, sc.*, the message of the Gospel (see reff. and *cf.* chap. ii. 17, iv. 2), *in the Power of God*, which (Rom. i. 16, 1 Cor. i. 18) he declares the Gospel itself to be. This, of course, is not the force of the phrase here; nor are we to think solely of "miraculous" powers (Acts viii. 10, 1 Cor. ii. 5), which were "signs of an Apostle" (Rom. xv. 19, chap. xii. 12), but of the Divine grace given him for his special work (see reff.). "In verbo veritatis, in virtute Dei" may still stand for the watchword of Christian preaching. —(iii.) We have now three clauses beginning with **διά**; the preposition in the first of them being *instrumental*, in the other two expressing a state or condition. —(*a*) **διὰ τῶν ὅπλων τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῶν δεξιῶν καὶ ἀριστερῶν**: *by the weapons of Righteousness on the right hand and on the left, sc.*, both offensive and defensive armour—the sword on the right and the shield on the left. See Eph. vi. 11, 1 Thess. v. 8 for St. Paul's more detailed description of "the panoply of God"; the idea being apparently taken from Wisd. v. 18 ff.; *cf.* for **ὅπλα δικαιοσύνης** Rom. vi. 13.

Ver. 8. (*b*) **διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀτιμίας, διὰ δυσφημίας καὶ εὐφημίας**: *by glory* (*cf.* John v. 41) *and dishonour, by evil report and good report.* To misrepresentation and slander St. Paul was much exposed, and he evidently felt it deeply (*cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 12).—(iv.) Finally, he proceeds to specify the charges made against him by his opponents; he can afford to neglect them, inasmuch as in each case they are quite opposed to the real facts. Towards the close he adds one or two antitheses to the list, which may not have been *directly* suggested by the current calumnies about him, but which are yet quite in keeping with the rest. There are seven antitheses in all.—**ὡς πλάνοι καὶ ἀληθεῖς**: *as deceivers* (so his opponents said of him, as it was formerly said of his Master, John vii. 12; *cf.* chap. ii. 17, iv. 2) *and yet true.* In the Clementines St. Paul is expressly described by his adversaries as **πλάνος** and as disseminating deceit (**πλάνην**).

Ver. 9. **ὡς ἀγνοούμενοι καὶ ἐπιγινωσκόμενοι**: *as unknown, sc.*, an obscure person without proper credentials (*cf.* iii. 2, x. 10), *and yet well known* (*cf.* xi. 6).—**ὡς ἀποθνήσκοντες καὶ ἰδοὺ ζῶμεν**: *as dying* (as was doubtless often reported when he was ill; see on i. 8 above, and *cf.* xi. 23, where he speaks of the continual hazards of his life), *and behold we live* (*cf.* iv. 10, where the death of the body is contrasted with the daily manifestation of the true life).—**ὡς παιδευόμενοι καὶ μὴ**

ζῶμεν· ὡς [l]παιδευόμενοι,[1] καὶ μὴ [m]θανατούμενοι· 10. ὡς λυπούμενοι, [n]ἀεὶ δὲ [n]χαίροντες· ὡς πτωχοί, πολλοὺς δὲ [o]πλουτίζοντες· ὡς μηδὲν ἔχοντες, καὶ πάντα [p]κατέχοντες.

11. Τὸ [q]στόμα ἡμῶν [q]ἀνέῳγε πρὸς ὑμᾶς, Κορίνθιοι,[2] ἡ [r]καρδία ἡμῶν[3] [r]πεπλάτυνται· 12. οὐ [s]στενοχωρεῖσθε ἐν ἡμῖν, στενοχωρεῖσθε δὲ ἐν τοῖς [t]σπλάγχνοις ὑμῶν· 13. τὴν δὲ αὐτὴν [u]ἀντιμισθίαν (ὡς

l 1 Cor. xi. 32; 2 Tim. ii. 25; Heb. xii. 7, 10. m Rom. vii. 4, viii. 13, 36. n Rom. xii. 12; Phil. iv. 4; 1 Thess. v. 16. o 1 Cor. i. 5; chap. ix. 11 only. p 1 Cor. vii. 30, xi. 2, xv. 2; 1 Thess. v. 21. q Ps. lxxvii. 2; Prov. xxix. 45; *cf.* Eph. vi. 19. r Deut. xi. 16; Ps. cxviii. 32. s Chap. iv. 8 only. t Chap. vii. 15; Phil. ii. 1; Col. iii. 12; Philm. 7, 12. u Rom. i. 27 only.

[1] D*G, d, e, g have **πειραζομενοι** for **παιδευομ.**

[2] **ω Κορινθιοι** G, f, vg. and the Bohairic. [3] ℵB have **η καρδ. υμων.**

θανατούμενοι: *as chastened, sc.*, as a punishment for his sins, which had very probably been said of him when the news of his grievous sickness (i. 8, etc.) reached his foes at Corinth, *but not killed*. He does not deny that he has been "chastened" (see reff. and *cf.* chap. xii. 7-9), but he recalls in thankfulness the words of Ps. cxvii. 18, **παιδεύων ἐπαίδευσέν με Κύριος, καὶ τῷ θανάτῳ οὐ παρέδωκέν με.**

Ver. 10. **ὡς λυπούμενοι, ἀεὶ δὲ χαίροντες**: *as sorrowful* (this charge in one sense was no doubt quite true), *yet alway rejoicing*. This, which is frequently spoken of by the Apostle as a Christian duty (see reff.), is specially prominent in this Epistle; *cf.* chap. i. 24, vii. 4, and the note on ii. 2, 3. St. Paul's words are an echo of the farewell words of Christ (John xvi. 22), **ὑμεῖς οὖν νῦν μὲν λύπην ἔχετε . . . τὴν χαρὰν ὑμῶν οὐδεὶς ἀρεῖ ἀφ' ὑμῶν.—ὡς πτωχοί, πολλοὺς δὲ πλουτίζοντες**: *as poor, sc.*, as a pauper—the word is stronger than **πένης** (the taunt seems to have been thrown at him; *cf.* Phil. iv. 12 and chap. xi. 7), *and yet making many rich, sc.*, in the heavenly riches; *cf.* 1 Cor. i. 5, Matt. v. 3, and esp. Prov. xiii. 7 (a passage which seems to have been in the Apostle's mind), **εἰσὶν οἱ πλουτίζοντες ἑαυτοὺς μηδὲν ἔχοντες, καὶ εἰσὶν οἱ ταπεινοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς ἐν πολλῷ πλούτῳ.—ὡς μηδὲν ἔχοντες καὶ πάντα κατέχοντες**: *as having nothing and yet possessing all things; cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 22, "all things are yours". **κατέχειν** (see reff.) is a stronger word than **ἔχειν**; it is "to hold fast" or "to possess," as, *e.g.*, the land of promise (Josh. i. 11).

Vv. 11-13. Affectionate declaration of his frankness and sympathy, and an appeal that the Corinthians should show the same.—Ver. 11. **τὸ στόμα ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ.**: *our mouth is open* (**ἀνέῳγα = ἀνέῳγμαι**, as often in later Greek; observe its *present* signification, as at 1 Cor. xvi. 9) *unto you, O Corinthians, i.e.*, I am speaking quite candidly and freely to you (see reff.). Only here and at Gal. iii. 1, Phil. iv. 15, does St. Paul call his correspondents by name; here it emphasises the affectionate nature of his appeal, and it singles out the Corinthians from the wider circle to whom the letter was addressed (i. 1).—**ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ.**: *our heart is enlarged*, which is indeed the reason of his freedom of speech, for **ἐκ τοῦ περισσεύματος τῆς καρδίας τὸ στόμα λαλεῖ** (Matt. xii. 34). By enlargement of heart is meant here a widening of sympathy, and not the expansiveness of joy (Isa. lx. 5) or an increase in intelligence and wisdom (1 Kings iv. 29).

Ver. 12. **οὐ στενοχωρεῖσθε ἐν ἡμῖν κ.τ.λ.**: *ye are not straitened in us* (this carries on the metaphor of **πεπλάτυνται**), *but ye are straitened in your own affections; i.e.*, his adversaries at Corinth may have said that he was a man of narrow sympathies, and that there was no room in his heart for his Corinthian converts, but, in fact, the lack of sympathy was on *their* side—it is *they* that are "narrow-minded". **τὰ σπλάγχνα** = the upper viscera, *i.e.*, the heart, lungs and liver, the vital parts, and so may be rendered "the affections".

Ver. 13. **τὴν δὲ αὐτὴν ἀντιμισθίαν κ.τ.λ.**: *now for a recompense in like kind* (an accus. abs.)—*I speak as unto children, sc.*, who should respect and imitate their parents (*cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 14)—*be ye also enlarged, sc.*, in heart.

Vv. 14-vii. 1. Parenthetical.—He warns them against too familiar association with their Heathen Neighbours. These verses are somewhat perplexing, inasmuch as they seem to interrupt the appeal of vv. 11-13 by

v Here only; *cf.* Lev. xix. 19. τέκνοις λέγω) πλατύνθητε καὶ ὑμεῖς. 14. Μὴ[1] γίνεσθε [v]ἑτεροζυγοῦντες ἀπίστοις[2]· τίς γὰρ [w]μετοχὴ δικαιοσύνῃ[3] καὶ [x]ἀνομίᾳ; w Here only; Ps. cxxi. 3; *cf.* 1 Cor. x. 17, 21. τίς[4] δὲ [y]κοινωνία φωτὶ[5] πρὸς σκότος; 15. τίς δὲ [z]συμφώνησις Χριστῷ[6] πρὸς [a]Βελίαρ[7]; ἢ τίς [b]μερὶς πιστῷ[8] μετὰ ἀπίστου;

x Rom. iv. 7, vi. 19; 2 Thess. ii. 7; Tit. ii. 14. y Chaps. viii. 4, ix. 13, xiii. 13, etc.; *cf.* Ecclus. xiii. 17. z Here only; *cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 5; Lk. v. 36. a Here only. b Col. i. 12; *cf.* 1 Kings xii. 16.

[1] G, d, e, f, g and the Peshitto have **και μη**. [2] G has **μετα απιστων**.

[3] G has **δικαιοσυνης μετα ανομιας**; D* **δικαιοσυνης και αδικιας**; DcE **δικαιοσυνη και αδικια**.

[4] K and the Harclean text have **τις δε**; better **η τις** with the principal uncials and vss.

[5] D*, d, e give **φωτος**.

[6] DEGKL, g and the Syriac vss. give **Χριστῳ**; better **Χριστου** with ℵBCP 17, d, e, f and the Bohairic.

[7] **Βελιαρ** is the right spelling; D*EK have **βελιαν** and G **βελιαβ**; **βελιαλ** appears in a few cursives only, and in f, g, vg.

[8] B 17 and the Bohairic have **πιστου** for **πιστῳ**.

the introduction of an irrelevant warning. If they be omitted, the argument is quite consecutive, vii. 2 f. being in close and evident connexion with vi. 11-13. And it has been supposed that the whole section is an interpolation either (*a*) added by St. Paul after the arrival of Titus, in consequence of the news he had received as to the state of the Corinthian Church; or (*b*) belonging to another Pauline letter (possibly the Lost Epistle of 1 Cor. v. 9), and inserted here at a later date when a collection of Pauline letters began to be made; or (*c*) it has been regarded (*e.g.*, by Heinrici) as a fragment of an ancient homily, *not* by St. Paul, which has found a resting place here. It is urged in favour of the non-Pauline authorship of the section that (**α**) it contains a considerable number of words which do not occur elsewhere in St. Paul. To this it may be replied that **ἑτεροζυγεῖν** and **βελίαρ** have their origin in O.T. phraseology, while **μολυσμός** is a LXX word (see reff.); and that, as to the words **μετοχή, συμφώνησις, συγκατάθεσις,** it is not surprising that some of the synonyms which are found in this section should be comparatively rare. It is not easy to find (as has here been done, with no small skill) *five* distinct terms to convey almost the same idea. (**β**) Schmiedel urges that the phrase **μολυσμός σαρκός** (vii. 1) is quite un-Pauline, and that it is inconsistent with St. Paul's psychology to speak of being "cleansed" from it, inasmuch as for him the **σάρξ** is always tainted by sin. But there is no thought here of the taint of sin which remains in fallen man; **μολυσμός** is always used in the LXX (see reff.) of a too intimate association of the chosen people with heathen nations, and such "contamination" is exactly what it stands for in this place. As an argument on the other side, there occur in this section several quite common Pauline ideas and phrases, *e.g.*, the contrast of Christianity and heathendom as light and darkness (ver. 14), the description of Christians as God's temple (ver. 16), the phrases "the living God" (ver. 16) and "the fear of God" (vii. 1), the introduction of the term **ἀγαπητοί** (vii. 1), etc. We regard, therefore, the section as undoubtedly Pauline; and, further, its connexion with what precedes reveals itself on a close inspection of the phraseology. The Apostle has bidden the Corinthians "Be ye enlarged in heart". But he is reminded that this phrase has a bad meaning in the Law (Deut. xi. 16; see Chase, *Classical Review*, 1890, p. 151), where it is applied to that excessive tolerance which should permit the worship of other gods beside Jehovah; and so he hastens to give a warning (parenthetically introduced) to the Corinthians that he does not mean by enlargement of heart any undue tolerance of or contaminating association with their heathen neighbours (see on iv. 4 above for **ἄπιστος**).

Ver. 14. **Μὴ γίνεσθε ἑτεροζυγοῦντες κ.τ.λ.**: *be not* (mark that the pres. tense **γίνεσθε** indicates the beginning of a state, *sc.*, "do not become") *unequally yoked with unbelievers*, the constr. being "be not unequally yoked, as you would be if

16. τίς δὲ [c]συγκατάθεσις ναῷ Θεοῦ μετὰ εἰδώλων; ὑμεῖς[1] γὰρ [d]ναὸς[2] [de]Θεοῦ ἐστε[1] [e]ζῶντος, καθὼς[3] εἶπεν ὁ Θεός, "Ὅτι [f]ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ [g]ἐμπεριπατήσω· καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτῶν[4] Θεὸς, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονταί μοι[5] λαός". 17. [h]διὸ "ἐξέλθετε[6] ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν καὶ ἀφορίσθητε," λέγει Κύριος, "καὶ ἀκαθάρτου μὴ ἅπτεσθε·" "κἀγὼ εἰσδέξομαι ὑμᾶς, 18. καὶ [k]ἔσομαι ὑμῖν εἰς πατέρα, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔσεσθέ μοι εἰς υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας," [l]λέγει [l]Κύριος [l]παντοκράτωρ.

c Here only; *cf.* Lk. xxiii. 51.
d 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17; 2 Thess. ii. 4; *cf.* 1 Cor. vi. 19; Eph. ii. 21.
e Reff. iii. 3.
f Rom. viii. 11; Col. iii. 16; 2 Tim. i. 5, 14 only.
g Lev. xxvi. 12.
h Isa. lii. 11.
i Ezek. xx. 34; *cf.* Zeph. iii. 20.
k 2 Sam. vii. 14; *cf.* Isa. xliii. 6.
l 2 Sam. vii. 8; *cf.* Rev. iv. 8, etc.

[1] ℵcCDcEGK, f, g and the Syriac vss. (probably from 1 Cor. iii. 16) support **υμεις . . . εστε**; better **ημεις . . . εσμεν** with ℵ*BD*LP, d, e and the Bohairic.

[2] ℵ* has **ναοι**.

[3] For **καθως ειπεν** D*EG, d, e, g have (wrongly) **λεγει γαρ** (see note).

[4] GP, g have **αυτοις** for **αυτων**.

[5] DEGKL, vg. read **μοι**; better **μου** with ℵBCP 17.

[6] DEKLP give **εξελθετε**; better **εξελθατε** with ℵBCG 17.

you were yoked with unbelievers". The most obvious application of such a prohibition would be to intermarriage with the heathen, which was continually forbidden to the chosen people (see Deut. vii. 3, Josh. xxiii. 12, Ezra ix. 2, Neh. xiii. 25), and this is probably the main thought here (see ref. Lev. for **ἑτερόζυγος**); but to indulge in *any* excessive familiarity of intercourse would be "to be enlarged in heart" in a way which the Apostle strongly deprecates (*cf.* 1 Macc. i. 15). He enforces this by five contrasts which illustrate the incongruity between Christianity and heathendom.—**τίς γὰρ μετοχὴ κ.τ.λ.**: *for what fellowship have righteousness and lawlessness? or what communion has light with darkness? Cf.* Eph. v. 7, **μὴ οὖν γίνεσθε συμμέτοχοι αὐτῶν· ἦτε γάρ ποτε σκότος, νῦν δὲ φῶς ἐν Κυρίῳ**, and *cf.*, for the same image, Acts xxvi. 18, Rom. xiii. 12, 1 Thess. v. 5 and chap. iv. 6, xi. 14.

Ver. 15. **τίς δὲ συμφώνησις κ.τ.λ.**: *and what concord has Christ with Belial? or what portion has a believer, sc.*, a Christian (see Acts xvi. 1, Eph. i. 1, Col. i. 2, etc.), *with an unbeliever, sc.*, a heathen (see on iv. 4 above)? בְּלִיַּעַל = *worthlessness* is frequently rendered **παράνομος** (Deut. xiii. 13, 1 Kings xx. 13) or **ἀνομία** (Ps. xvii. 5) by the LXX; they never treat it as a proper name, although Theodotion does so at Judges xix. 22, and it is so regarded in later literature (*e.g.*, *Test. XII. Patriarch.* and *Orac. Sibyll.*, iii., 63, 73). Here it is the personification of **ἀνομία**, just as Christ is the personification of **δικαιοσύνη**; the contrast is that between Christ and Satan (*cf.* 1 Cor. x. 21). See Charles' *Ascension of Isaiah*, pp. lv. ff., for the identification of Beliar with Satan. The Hebrew form, *Belial*, with a substitution of *r* for *l*, is written **βελίαρ** in the best Greek MSS. (see crit. note).

Ver. 16. **τίς δὲ συγκατάθεσις κ.τ.λ.**: *and what agreement has the Temple of God with idols?* It is quite unnecessary to mark the absence of the article by translating "*a* temple of God": **ναὸς Θεοῦ** has become anarthrous, as a quasi-technical phrase, and in the Apostle's thought there is only one such Temple, which is built up by the whole body of believers (see reff.).—**ἡμεῖς γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**: *for we are the Temple of a God who is alive* (see reff.); note that **ζῶντος** as the emphatic word is placed last.—**καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ.**: *as God said*, "*I will dwell in them* (these words are only a paraphrase of Lev. xxvi. 11; the quotation begins with ver. 12) *and walk in them, and I will be their God, and they shall be My people*" (*cf.* Exod. vi. 7, Jer. xxxi. 33, Ezek. xi. 20, Zech. viii. 8, xiii. 9, etc., where the promise is reiterated). Several passages of the O.T., *viz.*, Lev. xxvi. 12, Isa. lii. 11, Ezek. xx. 34 and 2 Sam. vii. 14 are here combined; and it is worth noticing that the first, second and fourth of these are marked as distinct quotations by the introductory formulæ which precede them in the O.T. in each case, *viz.*, **καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ Θεός** from Lev. xxvi. 12, **λέγει Κύριος** from Isa. lii. 5 (or Ezek. xx. 33), and **λέγει Κύριος παντοκράτωρ** from 2 Sam. vii. 8.

VII. 1. Ταύτας οὖν ἔχοντες τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, [a] ἀγαπητοί, [b] καθαρίσωμεν ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς [c] μολυσμοῦ σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος, [d] ἐπιτελοῦντες [e] ἁγιωσύνην ἐν [f] φόβῳ [f] Θεοῦ.

2. [g] Χωρήσατε ἡμᾶς· οὐδένα ἠδικήσαμεν, οὐδένα [h] ἐφθείραμεν,

a Rom. xii. 19; 1 Cor. x. 14, xv. 58; chap. xii. 19; Phil. ii. 12, iv. 1. b Eph. v. 26; Tit. ii. 14 only in Paul. c Here only; Jer. xxiii. 15; 1 Esdras viii. 33; 2 Macc. v. 27 only; *cf.* 1 Cor. viii. 7. d Rom. xv. 28; chap. viii. 6, 11; Gal. iii. 3; Phil. i. 6. e Rom. i. 4; 1 Thess. iii. 13 only. f Rom. iii. 18 only (Ps. xxxv. 2); Isa. xi. 3; *cf.* chap. v. 11. g Gen. xiii. 6; John ii. 6. h 1 Cor. iii. 17, xv. 33; chap. xi. 3; Eph. iv. 22.

Ver. 17. **διὸ ἐξέλθετε κ.τ.λ.**: *wherefore, "Come out from among them and be separate," saith the Lord, "and touch not an unclean thing and I will receive you."* So, too, the Heavenly Voice of the Apocalypse cried "Come out of her" to those who were in danger of contamination with the sins of pagan Rome (Rev. xviii. 4). But the command must not be misapplied. St. Peter was wrong in "separating" himself from his Gentile brethren (Gal. ii. 12), as he was wrong in calling that "unclean" which God had cleansed (Acts x. 14). And St. Paul *never* counsels any at Corinth to "separate" himself from the body of his fellow Christians on account of their sinful lives. (1 Cor. v. 13 is a direction to the Church to excommunicate a sinful member, a quite different thing.) To the Apostle separation from *heathendom* was imperative, but separation from the *Christian Church* was a schism and a sin.

Ver. 18. **καὶ ἔσομαι κ.τ.λ.**: *and "I will be to you a Father, and ye shall be to Me sons and daughters," saith the Lord Almighty.* The ideal relation of Israel to Jehovah was that of a son to a father (Exod. iv. 22, Jer. xxxi. 9, Hos. i. 10); but the full meaning of such words was reserved for Him to teach who came to reveal the Father (Matt. xi. 27), as their full blessedness can be realised only by the heir of the Father's kingdom who "overcomes" at last (Rev. xxi. 7).

Chapter VII.—Ver. 1. **ταύτας οὖν ἔχοντες κ.τ.λ.**: *having therefore these* (note the emphasis given to **ταύτας** by its position) *promises, beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all contamination of flesh and spirit* (*cf.* 1 Pet. ii. 11, 1 John iii. 3). We find the construction **καθαρίζειν ἀπό** again in Ecclus. xxxviii. 10 and Heb. ix. 14 (see also Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstud.*, p. 44). We have already pointed out (on vi. 14) that **μολυσμός** is always used of the defilement which springs out of evil (and especially heathen) associations; this may affect the **πνεῦμα** (see on ii. 13) as well as the **σάρξ**.—**ἐπιτελοῦντες ἁγιωσύνην κ.τ.λ.**: *perfecting holiness in the fear of God, sc.*, the fear that man ought to feel towards God (see v. 11), which is, indeed, one of the gifts of the Divine Spirit (Isa. xi. 3), and which was repeatedly commended to the chosen people (Deut. vi. 2, Ps. cxi. 1). The practical issue of belief in the promises of the Old Covenant (which have a yet larger meaning under the New) is *positive* as well as *negative*, sanctification as well as separation. St. Paul's word for man's sanctification is **ἁγιασμός**, the *result* of which process is here expressed by **ἁγιωσύνη** (see reff.); this is especially an attribute of God in the O.T. (Pss. xcv. 6, xcvi. 12, cxliv. 5, 2 Macc. iii. 12).

Vv. 2-4. He claims their sympathy again. He now resumes the appeal which is interrupted at vi. 13 by the parenthetical warning vi. 14-vii. 1. —Ver. 2. **χωρήσατε ἡμᾶς κ.τ.λ.**: *make room for us, sc.*, in your hearts, *i.e.*, let there be no **στενοχωρία** (vi. 12); *we wronged no man, we corrupted no man, we took advantage of no man.* Apparently accusations of this sort had been laid to his charge (see esp. chap. xii. 16, 17), and he is, as ever (chap. ii. 17, Acts xx. 33), careful to assert their baselessness. It is an excessive refinement of exegesis which finds here distinct charges hinted at in the three words **ἠδικήσαμεν, ἐφθείραμεν, ἐπλεονεκτήσαμεν.** They are used quite generally, the only one that offers any ambiguity being the second, **φθείρειν** often (see reff.), though not always, carrying a reference to bodily defilement through lust; here (as at 1 Cor. iii. 17) it seems to connote injury of any sort.

Ver. 3. **πρὸς κατάκρ. κ.τ.λ.**: *I do not say this by way of condemnation* (*i.e.*, do not think that I accuse *you* of mistrusting me); *for I have said before* (*viz.*, in iii. 2, vi. 11) *that ye are in our hearts* (*cf.* Phil. i. 7) *to die together and to live together* (*cf.* i. 6), *i.e.*, your image is in my heart in life and in death. Where there is such a wealth of sympathy as this, there can be no thought of "condemnation". Wetstein gives a good verbal parallel from Athenæus (vi., 249), **τούτους**

οὐδένα [i] ἐπλεονεκτήσαμεν. 3. οὐ[1] πρὸς [k] κατάκρισιν λέγω· [l] προείρηκα γὰρ ὅτι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν ἐστε[2] εἰς τὸ [m] συναποθανεῖν καὶ [n] συζῆν. 4. πολλή μοι [o] παῤῥησία πρὸς[3] ὑμᾶς, πολλή μοι [p] καύχησις ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν· πεπλήρωμαι τῇ παρακλήσει, [q] ὑπερπερισσεύομαι τῇ[4] χαρᾷ ἐπὶ πάσῃ[5] τῇ [r] θλίψει ἡμῶν. 5. καὶ γὰρ ἐλθούντων ἡμῶν εἰς Μακεδονίαν, οὐδεμίαν ἔσχηκεν[6] [s] ἄνεσιν ἡ σὰρξ ἡμῶν, ἀλλ' [t] ἐν [t] παντὶ [t] θλιβόμενοι[7]· ἔξωθεν μάχαι, ἔσωθεν φόβοι. 6. ἀλλ' ὁ [u] παρακαλῶν τοὺς [u v] ταπεινοὺς παρεκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ [w] παρουσίᾳ Τίτου· 7. [x] οὐ [x] μόνον [x] δὲ[8] ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ, [x] ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει ᾗ παρεκλήθη ἐφ' ὑμῖν, ἀναγγέλλων ἡμῖν[9] τὴν ὑμῶν [y] ἐπιπόθησιν, τὸν ὑμῶν [z] ὀδυρμόν, τὸν ὑμῶν [a] ζῆλον

i Reff. ii. 11.
k Chap. iii. 8 only.
l Chap. xiii. 2.
m Mk. xiv. 31; 2 Tim. ii. 11 only.
n Rom. vi. 8; 2 Tim. ii. 11 only.
o Reff. iii. 12.
p Reff. i. 12.
q Rom. v. 20 only.
r Reff. i. 4.
s Reff. ii. 13.
t Reff. iv. 8.
u Isa. xlix. 13; see reff. i. 4.
v Matt. xi. 29; Lk. i. 52; Rom. xii. 16; chap. x. 1; Jas. i. 9, iv. 6; 1 Pet. v. 5 only.
w 1 Cor. xvi. 17; chap. x. 10; Phil. i. 26, ii. 12.
x Rom. v. 3, 11, viii. 23, ix. 10; chap. viii. 19, etc.
y Ver. 11 only; *cf.* reff. v. 2.
z Matt. ii. 18 (Jer. xxxi. 15); 2 Macc. xi. 6 only.
a Rom. x. 2; chaps. vii. 11, ix. 2, xi. 2; Phil. iii. 6; Col. iv. 13.

[1] **ου προς κατακρ.** is the order of DEGKL, etc.; better **προς κατακρ. ου** with ℵBCP.

[2] B om. **εστε.** [3] D*E, d, e and the Peshitto have **προς υμας εστιν.**

[4] B has **εν τη χαρᾳ.** [5] After **παση τη** D*E* have **πολλη.**

[6] ℵCDELP have **εσχηκεν**; BGK have **εσχεν**; CG and the Syriac vss. put **εσχ.** after **ανεσιν.**

[7] D*, d, e give **θλιβομενος.** [8] G, g and the Peshitto omit **δε** after **μονον.**

[9] ℵ*D* have **αναγγ. υμιν.**

δ' οἱ βασιλεῖς ἔχουσι συζῶντας καὶ συναποθνησκόντας.

Ver. 4. **πολλή μοι παρρησία κ.τ.λ.**: *great is my boldness of speech towards you* (*cf.* vi. 11), *great is my glorying on your behalf*, *sc.*, on account of the good news of their conduct (*cf.* i. 14, iii. 2), *I am filled with comfort* (for the constr. *cf.* Luke ii. 40, Rom. i. 29, 2 Macc. vii. 21), *sc.*, with *the* comfort (note the article) which Titus had brought, *I overflow with joy* (*cf.* Phil. ii. 17, Col. i. 24) *in all our affliction* (see vi. 10).

Vv. 5-12. HE WAS COMFORTED TO LEARN FROM TITUS THAT HIS REBUKE HAD BEEN PROFITABLE. *Cf.* throughout 1 Thess. iii. 1-8, a passage strikingly like this in its human sympathy and kindliness.—Ver. 5. **καὶ γὰρ ἐλθόντων κ.τ.λ.**: *for even when we were come into Macedonia* (he has explained in ii. 12 his anxiety when he was at Troas, but it remained with him even when he had crossed into Europe) *our flesh had no relief* (see note on the similar phrase, ii. 13), *but* [*we were*] *afflicted on every side.* Note the anacoluthon, the participle **θλιβόμενοι** being used as if it were a finite verb (*cf.* v. 12 for a like constr.).—**ἔξωθεν μάχαι κ.τ.λ.**: *without were fightings*, *sc.*, with adversaries (*cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 32), *within were fears*, *sc.*, the anxieties which the Apostle would feel for his converts, especially those at Corinth (*cf.* chap. xi. 28). It will be noticed that the familiar cadence "fightings within and fears without" is a misquotation.

Ver. 6. **ἀλλ' ὁ παρακαλῶν κ.τ.λ.**: *but He that comforteth the lowly* (see ref. Isa.), *even God* (to whom he is especially careful in this Epistle to trace up all grace and consolation), *comforted us by the coming of Titus.* **παρουσία** is often used for the Advent of Christ, but also (see reff.) for the advent of St. Paul or his companions. This is the first explicit mention of St. Paul's meeting with Titus in Macedonia (but *cf.* ii. 13) which was the occasion of the letter being written.

Ver. 7. **οὐ μόνον δὲ κ.τ.λ.**: *and not by his coming only, but also* (see reff. for constr.) *by the comfort wherewith he was comforted in respect of you* (*cf.* 1 Thess. iii. 7 for constr.), *i.e.*, "I was comforted, not only by his coming, but by the good news which he brought"; *while he told us your longing*, *sc.*, to see me, *your mourning*, *sc.*, at the rebuke which I sent you, *your zeal on my behalf.* **ζῆλος** may either mean "zeal," in a good

b Matt. xxi. 30, 32, xxvii. 3; Heb. vii. 21 (Ps. cix. 4) only. c John v. 35; Gal. ii. 5; Philm. 15 only; *cf.* 1 Thess. ii. 17. d Acts xx. 21, xxvi. 20; Rom. ii. 4; ver. 10; 2 Tim. ii. 25; *cf.* chap. xii. 21; Acts xvii. 30.

ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ, ὥστε με[1] μᾶλλον χαρῆναι. 8. Ὅτι εἰ καὶ ἐλύπησα ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ,[2] οὐ[2] [b]μεταμέλομαι, εἰ[3] καὶ μετεμελόμην· βλέπω γὰρ[4] ὅτι ἡ ἐπιστολὴ ἐκείνη, εἰ καὶ [c]πρὸς [c]ὥραν, ἐλύπησεν[5] ὑμᾶς. 9. Νῦν χαίρω, οὐχ ὅτι ἐλυπήθητε, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐλυπήθητε εἰς [d]μετάνοιαν· ἐλυπήθητε γὰρ [e]κατὰ [e]Θεόν, ἵνα [f]ἐν μηδενὶ [g]ζημιωθῆτε ἐξ ἡμῶν. 10. ἡ γὰρ κατὰ Θεὸν λύπη μετάνοιαν εἰς σωτηρίαν [h]ἀμεταμέλητον κατεργάζεται[6]· ἡ δὲ τοῦ κόσμου λύπη θάνατον [i]κατεργάζεται. 11. ἰδοὺ γὰρ [k]αὐτὸ [k]τοῦτο τὸ κατὰ Θεὸν λυπηθῆναι ὑμᾶς,[7] πόσην κατειργάσατο[8] ὑμῖν[9] [l]σπουδήν, ἀλλὰ [m]ἀπολογίαν, ἀλλὰ [n]ἀγανάκτησιν, ἀλλὰ φόβον, ἀλλὰ [o]ἐπιπόθησιν, ἀλλὰ [o]ζῆλον, ἀλλ' [p]ἐκδίκησιν. [q]ἐν [q]παντὶ [r]συνεστήσατε [r]ἑαυτοὺς [s]ἁγνοὺς εἶναι [t]ἐν[10] τῷ [t]πράγματι.

e Rom. viii. 27; Eph. iv. 24; *cf.* chap. xi. 17. f Reff. vi. 3. g 1 Cor. iii. 15; Phil. iii. 8. h Rom. xi. 29 only. i Reff. iv. 17. k Reff. ii. 3. l Rom. xii. 8, 11; ver. 12; chap. viii. 7, 8, 16. m 1 Cor. ix. 3; Phil. i. 7, 16; 2 Tim. iv. 16. n Here only; *cf.* Mk. x. 14. o Reff. ver. 7. p Rom. xii. 19 (Deut. xxxii. 35); 2 Thess. i. 8 (Isa. lxvi. 15). q Reff. iv. 8. r Reff. iv. 2. s Chap. xi. 2; Phil. iv. 8; 1 Tim. v. 22; Tit. ii. 5; *cf.* vi. 6. t 1 Thess. iv. 6.

[1] DE have **μαλλον με**; G **μαλλον χαρηναι με**; K om. **με.**

[2] After **επιστ.** D*EG, d, e, f, g add **μου** and the Harclean adds **μου πρωτῃ.**

[3] B has **ει δε και.**

[4] BD*, d, e, vg. om. **γαρ**; Lachmann and Hort think that vg. (*videns*) has alone preserved the true reading, *viz.*, **βλεπων** (see note below).

[5] G, f, g, vg. have **υμ. ελυπησεν.**

[6] ℵ[c]GKL give **κατεργαζεται**; better (here) **εργαζεται** with ℵ*BCDEP.

[7] ℵ[c]DEKLP, d, e, vg. read **υμας**; better om. with ℵ*BCG 17, g.

[8] ℵB[3]CGKLP have **κατειργασατο**; B*DE have **κατηργασατο.**

[9] ℵ[c]CGP, f, g, vg. and the Syriac give **εν υμιν**; om. **εν** ℵ*BDEKL.

[10] D[bc]EKLP, d, e give **εν τῳ πραγμ.**; better om. **εν** with ℵBCD*G, f, g, harsh though the resulting constr. is.

sense, as here (see reff.), or "jealousy," in a bad sense (see reff. xii. 20).—**ὥστε με μᾶλλον χαρῆναι**: *so that I rejoiced yet more, sc.*, than at the mere coming of Titus with his news (*cf.* ver. 13).

Ver. 8. **ὅτι εἰ καὶ ἐλύπησα κ.τ.λ.**: *for though I made you sorry with my epistle* (*sc.*, esp. 1 Cor. v.; *cf. Introd.*, p. 14), *I do not regret it; though I did regret it* (*for I see that that epistle made you sorry, though but for a season*), *yet now I rejoice*, etc. We follow the punctuation adopted by Tisch., W.H. and the American Revisers, the second clause softening the apparent harshness of the first, and **βλέπω γάρ . . . ὥραν** being a parenthetic explanation.

Ver. 9. **νῦν χαίρω κ.τ.λ.**: *now, sc.*, now that Titus is come, and I have learnt the effect of my letter, *I rejoice, not that ye were made sorry, but that ye were made sorry unto repentance* (of which there was no sign when he wrote; see 1 Cor. v. 2), *for ye were made sorry according to the will of God, sc.*, in God's way as contrasted with man's way (*cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 32 and see reff.), *so that ye might suffer loss by us in nothing, i.e.*, the sorrow caused by my rebuke was divinely ordered for your good, so that my severity did not hurt but rather benefited you. The *word* **μετάνοια** occurs curiously seldom in St. Paul (see reff.), perhaps because it indicates the very first step in the religious life, that "change of mind" as to God which precedes even the renunciation of sin (see esp. for this use reff., Acts and Matt. iii. 2, iv. 17, Acts ii. 38, etc.), and this first step his correspondents had already taken, or his letters to them would not have been written.

Ver. 10. **ἡ γὰρ κατὰ Θεὸν λύπη κ.τ.λ.**: *for such godly sorrow, i.e.*, sorrow for sin as an offence against God (Ps. l. 6) and not only for the temporal consequences of sin (*cf.* Bengel, "animi Deum

12. ἄρα εἰ καὶ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, οὐχ εἵνεκεν τοῦ ἀδικήσαντος,[1] οὐδὲ[2] εἵνεκεν τοῦ ἀδικηθέντος[1]· ἀλλ' εἵνεκεν τοῦ [u]φανερωθῆναι τὴν [1]σπουδὴν[3] ὑμῶν τὴν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν[4] πρὸς ὑμᾶς [v]ἐνώπιον τοῦ [v]Θεοῦ. 13. Διὰ τοῦτο παρακεκλήμεθα ἐπὶ τῇ παρακλήσει ὑμῶν[5]· περισσοτέρως δὲ[6] μᾶλλον ἐχάρημεν ἐπὶ τῇ χαρᾷ Τίτου, ὅτι [w]ἀναπέπαυται τὸ [x]πνεῦμα

u Reff. ii. 14. v Reff. iv. 2. w 1 Cor. xvi. 18; Philm. 7, 20. x See on ii. 13.

[1] D*E have αδικηθεντος . . . αδικησαντος. [2] ℵcB, 37, 73 have αλλ' ουδε.

[3] G (not F), d*, g give σπουδην ημων. [4] ℵD*F have υπερ υμων.

[5] FKL, the Bohairic and Harclean support παρακλ. υμων; better ημων with ℵBCDEGP, vg. and Peshitto.

[6] All the uncials place δε, not before μαλλον, but between επι and τη παρακλησει.

spectantis et sequentis"), *worketh repentance* which leads *to salvation*, a repentance *which bringeth no regret*. ἀμεταμέλητον may be taken with σωτηρία (see R.V. margin), but there would be no point in applying such an adj. to σωτηρία, whereas it is quite apposite as applied to μετάνοια (as by Chrys., R.V., etc.).—ἡ δὲ τοῦ κόσμου κ.τ.λ.: *but the sorrow of the world, sc.*, such sorrow as the world feels—for failure, not for sin—*worketh out death, sc.*, as opposed to σωτηρία (*cf.* chap. ii. 16).

Ver. 11. ἰδοὺ γὰρ αὐτὸ κ.τ.λ.: *for behold, this same thing, viz., that you were made sorry after a godly sort, what diligence it wrought in you, yea* (*sc.*, "not only so, but also," ἀλλά introducing an accessory idea) *what a defence, sc.*, of yourselves to me through the mediation of Titus, *yea what indignation, yea what fear, sc.*, of St. Paul's rebukes, *yea what longing, sc.*, that he should come to them (see ver. 7), *yea what zeal, sc.*, on behalf of God and righteousness, *yea what avenging, sc.*, the heavy punishment solemnly inflicted on the offender in God's name (chap. ii. 6). Observe that ἐκδίκησις and ἐκδικέω are *always* (see reff. and Luke xviii. 7, 1 Pet. ii. 14, etc.) used of *God's* avenging of sin, not of man's retaliation.—ἐν παντὶ κ.τ.λ.: *in everything ye approved yourselves to be pure in the matter, i.e.*, not that they were quite free from gross sins of the flesh (see xii. 21), but that by their ready compliance with the Apostle's directions they had cleared themselves from the guilt of connivance at incest (see ii. 6). τῷ πράγματι (the dat. of regard) is a vague phrase used here and at 1 Thess. iv. 6 to denote abominable wickedness.

Ver. 12. ἄρα εἰ καὶ ἔγραψα κ.τ.λ.: *consequently, although I wrote to you, i.e.*, wrote a severe letter, *it was not for his cause that did the wrong, sc.*, the incestuous son of 1 Cor. v. 1, *nor for his cause that suffered the wrong, sc.*, his father, *but that your diligence on our behalf might be made manifest to yourselves* ("chez vous," so πρὸς ὑμᾶς, 1 Thess. iii. 4) *in the sight of God.* He does not mean that this was the *only* reason for writing (*cf.* ii. 9), and that the more obvious reason was not in his mind; but he states strongly (expressing himself by an idiom common in the O.T., *e.g.*, Jer. vii. 22) a principal cause of his writing, *viz.*, that the Corinthian Church might be recalled to a true sense of what was due to its founder, as if it were the only cause. See on ii. 9, and, for a discussion of the whole question, see *Introd.*, p. 10 ff.

Ver. 13. διὰ τοῦτο παρακεκλ.: *wherefore we have been comforted.* With Tisch., W.H. and modern editors generally we place a full stop here. What follows introduces a new idea.

Vv. 13-16. The Joy of Titus in the Tidings he brought. Chrysostom notes the tact which leads St. Paul to communicate this so emphatically; Titus was going back to Corinth on the business of the collection (viii. 6, 16, 23), and it was very desirable that he should be well received there.—ἐπὶ δὲ τῇ παρακλήσει ἡμῶν περισσοτέρως μᾶλλον κ.τ.λ.: *and in addition to this comfort of ours we rejoiced the more exceedingly* (*cf.* ver. 7, and for the double comparative *cf.* Mark vii. 36, Phil. i. 23) *at* (for the constr. χαίρειν ἐπὶ *cf.* 1 Cor. xiii. 6, xvi. 17, etc.) *the joy of Titus, because his spirit hath been refreshed by you all* (*cf.* the somewhat similar use of ἀπό in chap. ii. 3, Matt. xi. 19, Acts ii. 22). Both here and at ver. 15 πάντων is emphasised by its position before ὑμῶν; Titus was well received by *all* at Corinth, and it seems to be implied at xii. 18 that he left a favourable impression upon them all.

y 1 Cor. i. 27, xi. 4, 5, 22; chap. ix. 4.
z Reff. i. 12.
a Reff. vi. 12.
b 1 Cor. iv. 17; 2 Tim. i. 6.
c 1 Cor. ii. 3; Eph. vi. 5; Phil. ii. 12; Isa. xix. 16.
d See on iv. 8.
e Reff. v. 6.

αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ πάντων ὑμῶν· 14. ὅτι εἴ τι αὐτῷ ὑπὲρ[1] ὑμῶν κεκαύχημαι, οὐ [y] κατῃσχύνθην· ἀλλ᾽ ὡς πάντα[2] ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ἐλαλήσαμεν ὑμῖν,[3] οὕτω καὶ ἡ [z] καύχησις ἡμῶν[4] ἡ[5] ἐπὶ[6] Τίτου ἀλήθεια ἐγενήθη· 15. καὶ τὰ [a] σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ περισσοτέρως εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐστιν, [b] ἀναμιμνησκομένου τὴν πάντων[7] ὑμῶν ὑπακοήν, ὡς μετὰ [c] φόβου καὶ [c] τρόμου ἐδέξασθε αὐτόν. 16. χαίρω ὅτι [d] ἐν [d] παντὶ [e] θαῤῥῶ ἐν ὑμῖν.

[1] G, g, the Peshitto and Bohairic give the order κεκ. υπ. ημων.

[2] CG, g, the Harclean and Bohairic have παντοτε for παντα.

[3] CDEP, d, e, f place υμιν before εν αληθ. [4] BF have υμων for ημων.

[5] ℵ*B om. η before επι (so Tisch. and W.H.).

[6] DEGP have προς Τιτον. [7] ℵ* om. παντων.

Ver. 14. **ὅτι εἴ τι κ.τ.λ.**: *for if in anything I have gloried to him on your behalf, i.e.*, have boasted of you (*cf.* ix. 2, xii. 5), *I was not put to shame, sc.*, by the vanity of my boasting being exposed; *but as we spake all things to you in truth* (this he is continually insisting on, *e.g.*, at i. 18, ii. 17, iv. 2, etc.), *so our glorying also, viz., that made before Titus* (*cf.* Mark xiii. 9 for **ἐπί** with the gen.), *was found* (not "is found" as A.V., but "*was* found" as at 1 Cor. i. 30) *to be truth.*

Ver. 15. **καὶ τὰ σπλάγχνα κ.τ.λ.**: *and his heart is more abundantly towards you, while he recalls to himself the obedience of you all, how with fear* (see reff. and *cf.* Matt. xxviii. 8, 1 Pet. iii. 15, for **μετὰ φόβου**) *and trembling you received him.* He had brought a stern message, which involved the excommunication of the unworthy member (1 Cor. v. 5); it was no wonder that they trembled at his coming.

Ver. 16. **χαίρω ὅτι κ.τ.λ.**: *I rejoice that in everything I am of good courage* (not as A.V. "I have confidence," which would be **πέποιθα**) *concerning you.*

II. The Collection for the Judæan Christians (viii. 1-ix. 15). We have now come to the second main topic of the Epistle, *viz.*, the collection to be made at Corinth, as in all the Christian communities which the Apostle had founded, on behalf of the poor Christians at Judæa (chaps. viii. and ix.). We first hear of this great undertaking at 1 Cor. xvi. 1, but it is plain from that passage as well as from 2 Cor. viii. 10, ix. 2, that it had been organised some time before 1 *Cor.* was written. (See *Introd.*, p. 6.) The poverty of the Christians at Jerusalem, however caused, was evidently acute; and when St. Paul first parted from the Twelve on his mission to the Gentiles, one of the stipulations made with him was that he should "remember the poor" (Gal. ii. 10). This stipulation he faithfully observed, and it was to convey the money thus entrusted to him to its proper recipients that he paid his last visit to Jerusalem (Acts xxiv. 17). See further the excellent discussion in Stanley's note on 1 Cor. xvi. 1.

Chap. viii. vv. 1-7. THE LIBERALITY OF THE MACEDONIAN CHURCHES—AN EXAMPLE TO CORINTH.—Ver. 1. **Γνωρίζομεν δὲ ὑμῖν κ.τ.λ.**: *moreover* (for this is the force of the **δὲ μεταβατικόν**, marking the transition to a new subject; *cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 1, viii. 1, xv. 1, chap. x. 1, etc.), *brethren, we make known to you the grace of God, sc.*, the special grace of liberality in giving, *which has been given in, i.e.*, given to and exhibited in (see on i. 22), *the Churches of Macedonia, e.g.*, Philippi, Thessalonica and Berœa (Acts xvi. and xvii.), which places we may presume he revisited on this journey.

Ver. 2. **ὅτι ἐν πολλῇ δοκιμῇ κ.τ.λ.**: *how that in much proof of affliction, i.e.*, in spite of the severe afflictions by which they were tried, probably a reference to persecution and annoyance from their heathen neighbours (see Acts xvi. 20, Phil. i. 28, 1 Thess. i. 6, ii. 14, iii. 3-9), *the abundance of their joy and their deep poverty* (**κατὰ βάθους** = "reaching deep down"; *cf.* the phrase in Strabo, ix., 419, **ἄντρον κοῖλον κατὰ βάθους**) *abounded unto the riches of their liberality.* **ἁπλοῦς** means primarily "simple," "single-minded" (Matt. vi. 22), and **ἁπλότης** is thus used by St. Paul in chap. xi. 3, Eph. vi. 5, Col. iii. 22; but single-mindedness or "heartiness" of giving (see 1 Chron. xxix. 17) involves "liber-

VIII. 1. ΓΝΩΡΙΖΟΜΕΝ δὲ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν δεδομένην ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Μακεδονίας· 2. ὅτι ἐν πολλῇ [a] δοκιμῇ [b] θλίψεως ἡ [c] περισσεία τῆς χαρᾶς αὐτῶν καὶ ἡ κατὰ βάθους [d] πτωχεία αὐτῶν ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς τὸν[1] πλοῦτον τῆς [e] ἁπλότητος αὐτῶν· 3. ὅτι κατὰ δύναμιν, [f] μαρτυρῶ, καὶ ὑπὲρ[2] δύναμιν [g] αὐθαίρετοι, 4. μετὰ πολλῆς παρακλήσεως δεόμενοι ἡμῶν, τὴν χάριν καὶ τὴν [h] κοινωνίαν τῆς διακονίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς [i] ἁγίους δέξασθαι[3] ἡμᾶς· 5. καὶ οὐ καθὼς ἠλπίσαμεν,[4] ἀλλ' ἑαυτοὺς ἔδωκαν πρῶτον τῷ Κυρίῳ, καὶ ἡμῖν [k] διὰ [k] θελήματος [k] Θεοῦ· 6. εἰς τὸ παρακαλέσαι ἡμᾶς Τίτον, ἵνα, καθὼς [l] προενήρξατο,[5] οὕτω καὶ [m] ἐπιτελέσῃ εἰς ὑμᾶς καὶ

a Reff. ii. 9. b Reff. i. 4. c Rom. v. 17; chap. x. 15; Jas. i. 21 only. d Ver 9; Rev. ii. 9 only. e Rom. xii. 8; chaps. ix. 11, 13, xi. 3; Eph. vi. 5; Col. iii. 22 only. f Rom. x. 2; Gal. iv. 15; Col. iv. 13. g Ver. 17 only. h Reff. vi. 14. i Reff. i. 1. k Reff. i. 1. l Ver. 10 only. m Reff. vii. 1.

[1] ℵ[c]DEGKL support **τον πλουτον**; better **το πλουτος** with ℵ*BCP 17 (*cf.* the same variant Eph. i. 7, ii. 7, iii. 8, 16, Phil. iv. 19, Col. ii. 2; in later Greek there is a tendency towards the neuter form; see crit. note on ix. 2).

[2] KLP give **υπερ δυν.**; better **παρα** with ℵBCDEG.

[3] **δεξασθαι ημας** is not found in the uncials and primary vss.; it is a mere explanatory gloss.

[4] B 73 have **ηλπικαμεν.**

[5] B has **ενηρξατο** (*cf.* ver. 10).

ality" in giving (*cf.* ix. 7), and thus in many passages (see reff. and *cf.* Jas. i. 5) *liberality* is the best rendering. The whole of Greece, except the Roman colonies of Patrae and Corinth, was in a dire condition of poverty and distress at this period (see Arnold's *Roman Commonwealth*, ii., 382, quoted by Stanley); and the contribution of the Macedonian Christians was really comparable to the giving of the widow's mite (Mark xii. 44). It is noteworthy that no warnings against the temptations of wealth occur in 1 and 2 Thess. or Phil. See, however, Lightfoot, *Bibl. Essays*, p. 247.

Ver. 3. **ὅτι κατὰ δύναμιν κ.τ.λ.**: *for according to their power, I bear witness, yea and beyond their power.* Field quotes a good parallel from Josephus, *Antt.*, iii., 6. 1, who has **κατὰ δύναμιν . . . παρὰ δύναμιν** as here.

Vv. 3, 4. **αὐθαίρετοι μετὰ πολλ. παρακ. κ.τ.λ.**: *of their own accord begging of us with much entreaty* (the constr. is clumsy but perhaps unbroken; we should expect **ἔδωκαν** after **αὐθαίρετοι**, but the verb is found in ver. 5) *the favour, sc.*, of giving (*cf.*, for this sense of **χάρις**, Acts xxiv. 27, xxv. 3, Ecclus. xxx. 6), *and the participation in the ministering to the saints, sc.*, the poor Christians in Judæa. The Macedonian Christians did not wait to be asked to give; they asked to be allowed the privilege of giving (*cf.* Acts xx. 35). **διακονία** is the regular word for such charitable service (*cf.* Acts vi. 1, xi. 29, Rom. xv. 25, 31, chap. ix. 1, 12, etc.), a primary duty of the **διάκονοι** being the administration of alms.

Ver. 5. **καὶ οὐ καθὼς κ.τ.λ.**: *and not* (merely) *as we hoped, i.e.*, beyond what we expected or hoped, *but first* (not only in order of time, but in order of importance; as we say "first of all") *they gave themselves to the Lord.* This is not merely the consecration of self (*cf.* Rom. xii. 1), which is the condition of all acceptable almsgiving, for this would not have been beyond the Apostle's expectations, but the devotion of personal service in the work of spreading the Gospel, such as was given by Sopater of Berœa, Aristarchus and Secundus of Thessalonica (Acts xx. 4), and Epaphroditus of Philippi (Phil. ii. 25). Other Macedonian Christians who are named as helpers of St. Paul are Jason (Acts xvii. 5 f.) and Gaius Acts xix. 29); possibly Demas also (Philm. 24, 2 Tim. iv. 10) was of Thessalonica, and it has been argued that St. Luke was of Philippi (see Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 202).—**καὶ ἡμῖν διὰ θελ. Θεοῦ**: *and to us* (some of them were St. Paul's companions in travel) *by the will of God.* Everywhere in St. Paul's writings the impulse to faithful service is traced up to God's grace.

Vv. 6, 7. **εἰς τὸ παρακαλέσαι κ.τ.λ.**: *so that we exhorted Titus* (the epistolary aor. infin.; this is the exhortation to Titus

n See on iv. 8.
o Rom. i. 29; 1 Cor. i. 5; chap. xii. 12; Eph. i. 3.
p Reff. vii. 11.
q Rom. xvi. 26; 1 Cor. vii. 6; 1 Tim. i. 1; Tit. i. 3.
r Phil. iv. 3; 1 Tim. i. 2; Tit. i. 4 only.
s 1 Cor. xi. 28; ver. 22; chap. xiii. 5; Gal. vi. 4; 1 Thess v. 21.
t Here only; Ps. xxxiii. 11; *cf.* chap. vi. 10, etc.
u Eph. ii. 4; 1 Tim. vi. 17.

τὴν χάριν ταύτην. 7. Ἀλλ' ὥσπερ [n] ἐν [n] παντὶ περισσεύετε,[1] πίστει[2] καὶ λόγῳ καὶ γνώσει καὶ [o] πάσῃ [p] σπουδῇ, καὶ τῇ ἐξ ὑμῶν[3] ἐν ἡμῖν ἀγάπῃ, ἵνα καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ χάριτι περισσεύητε.[4] 8. οὐ [q] κατ' ἐπιταγὴν λέγω, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς[5] ἑτέρων [p] σπουδῆς καὶ τὸ τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀγάπης [r] γνήσιον [s] δοκιμάζων[6]· 9. γινώσκετε γὰρ τὴν χάριν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,[7] ὅτι δι' ὑμᾶς[8] [t] ἐπτώχευσε [u] πλούσιος

[1] CP have περισσευητε.
[2] ℵ has εν πιστει.
[3] εξ υμων εν ημιν, ℵCDEGKLP, the Latin and Harclean vss., which gives the sense more agreeable to the context; B, the Peshitto and Bohairic give εξ ημων εν υμιν, which is preferred by W.H. and R.V. marg. (*cf.* the variants in vii. 12).
[4] D*E*G have περισσευσητε.
[5] DE have την ετ. σπουδην.
[6] D*G have δοκιμαζω.
[7] B om. Χριστου.
[8] CK have δι' ημας.

on his meeting with St. Paul in Macedonia after accomplishing his first Mission to Corinth; παρακαλ. is the word used throughout of the Apostle's directions to Titus; see viii. 17, ix. 5, xii. 17, and on chap. i. 4), *that as he made a beginning before, sc.*, in the matter of the collection, during the Mission from which he has now returned, *so he would also complete in you this grace also, i.e.*, the grace of liberal giving in addition to the graces of repentance and goodwill which rejoiced him so much to observe (vii. 13, 14). ἐπιτελεῖν is to bring to a successful issue a work already begun; see v. 11 below.—ἀλλ' ὥσπερ κ.τ.λ.: *yea rather* (ὥσπερ having an ascensive force as at i. 9, v. 7 being strictly parallel to and explanatory of v. 6) *that as ye abound* (*cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 58) *in everything* (so he had said of the Corinthians in 1 Cor. i. 5, ἐν παντὶ ἐπλουτίσθητε), *in faith* (see chap. i. 24 and 1 Cor. xii. 8, where πίστις is named as one of the gifts of the Spirit exhibited among them), *and utterance, i.e.*, the grace of ready exposition of the Gospel message, *and knowledge, i.e.*, of Divine things (λόγος and γνῶσις are conjoined, as here, at 1 Cor. i. 5, and γνῶσις is also mentioned with πίστις at 1 Cor. xii. 8; at 1 Cor. viii. 1 he points out with marked emphasis that γνῶσις is not comparable in importance to ἀγάπη as shown in condescension to a brother's intellectual weakness), *and all earnestness* (see reff. and *cf.* vii. 11, where he mentions the σπουδή that the Corinthians had exhibited when they received his message of reproof), *and in your love to us* (*cf.* i. 11 and viii. 24; the variant reading ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐν ὑμῖν would disturb the sense all through he is speaking of the graces of the Corinthians, not of his own), *so ye may abound in this grace also* (*cf.* ix. 8). The English versions and comm. take ἵνα with the subj. here as a periphrasis for the imperative, and understand some verb like βλέπετε, "*See* that ye abound, etc.," but this usage of ἵνα is unexampled. We follow Kennedy in taking v. 7 in close connexion with v. 6, although we do not agree with the inferences which he draws (*2 and 3 Cor.*, p. 122). V. 7 seems "to have been added by St. Paul," he rightly observes "to avoid any appearance of depreciating the work which Titus had already accomplished among the Corinthian Christians, by the description of it in v. 6 as a beginning". *Cf.* the shrewd remark of Grotius, "non ignoravit Paulus artem rhetorum, movere laudando".

Vv. 8-15. He counsels (though he will not command) that they follow the example of the Macedonian Churches, according to their ability.—Ver. 8. οὐ κατ' ἐπιταγὴν λέγω κ.τ.λ.: *I speak not by way of commandment, i.e.*, I do not give you an authoritative and formal command (as I might do), *but as proving through the earnestness of others, sc.*, the example of the Macedonian Churches (ver. 3), *the genuineness also of your love* (ver. 7). For the constr. τὸ γνήσιον τῆς ἀγάπης see on iv. 17.

Ver. 9. γινώσκετε γὰρ κ.τ.λ.: *for ye know the grace, i.e.*, the act of grace, *of our Lord Jesus Christ, that being rich, sc.*, in His pre-existent state before the Incarnation, *yet for your sakes* (*cf.* Rom. xv. 3) *He became poor, sc.*, in that κένωσις

ὧν, ἵνα ὑμεῖς τῇ[1] ἐκείνου [v]πτωχείᾳ [w]πλουτήσητε. 10. καὶ [x]γνώμην ἐν τούτῳ [x]δίδωμι· τοῦτο γὰρ ὑμῖν [y]συμφέρει, οἵτινες[2] οὐ μόνον τὸ ποιῆσαι[3] ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ θέλειν [z]προενήρξασθε[4] [a]ἀπὸ [a]πέρυσι· 11. νυνὶ δὲ καὶ τὸ ποιῆσαι [b]ἐπιτελέσατε, ὅπως καθάπερ ἡ [c]προθυμία τοῦ[5] θέλειν, οὕτω καὶ τὸ ἐπιτελέσαι ἐκ τοῦ ἔχειν. 12. Εἰ γὰρ ἡ προθυμία [d]πρόκειται, καθὸ ἐὰν[6] ἔχῃ τις, [e]εὐπρόσδεκτος, οὐ καθὸ οὐκ ἔχει.[7] 13. οὐ γὰρ ἵνα ἄλλοις [f]ἄνεσις, ὑμῖν δὲ[8] [g]θλῖψις· ἀλλ' ἐξ [h]ἰσότητος, ἐν [i]τῷ [i]νῦν [i]καιρῷ τὸ ὑμῶν [k]περίσσευμα εἰς τὸ ἐκείνων

v Reff. ver. 2.
w Rom. x. 12; 1 Cor. iv. 8; 1 Tim. vi. 9, 18.
x 1 Cor. vii. 25; *cf.* 1 Cor. i. 10; Philm. 14.
y 1 Cor. vi. 12, x. 23; chap. xii. 1.
z Ver. 6 only.
a Chap. ix. 2 only.
b Reff. vii. 1.
c Ver. 19, chap. ix. 2; Acts xvii. 11 only.
d Here only in Paul.
e Reff. vi. 2.
f Reff. ii. 13.
g Reff. i. 4.
h Col. iv. 1 only.
i Rom. iii. 26, viii. 18, xi. 5 only; Gen. xxx. 20.
k Here only in Paul.

[1] DEG have **αυτου.**

[2] G, f, g and the Peshitto give **οτι** for **οιτινες.**

[3] The Peshitto (mistaking the sense) interchanges **ποιησαι** and **θελειν.**

[4] D*G have **ενηρξασθαι** (*cf.* ver. 6).

[5] BCDᶜEKP read **εαν**; ℵD*GL have **αν.**

[6] C²L and the Bohairic support **τις,** but ℵBC*DEGKP and the Latins omit it.

[7] DEG, g add **τις** after **εχει.**

[8] ℵᶜDEGKLP, f, g, vg. and the Harclean support **νμιν δε**; ℵ*BC 17, d, e om. **δε.**

which the Incarnation involved (Phil. ii. 5, 6), (the aor. marks a def. point of time, "He *became* poor," not "He *was* poor"), *in order that ye by His poverty, i.e.*, His assumption of man's nature, *might be rich, i.e.*, in the manifold graces of the Incarnation (*cf.* 1 Cor. i. 5). This verse is parenthetical, introduced to give the highest example of love and self-sacrifice for others; there is nowhere in St. Paul a more definite statement of his belief in the pre-existence of Christ before His Incarnation (*cf.* John xvii. 5). It has been thought that **ἐπτώχευσε** carries an allusion to the poverty of the Lord's earthly life (Matt. viii. 20); but the *primary* reference cannot be to this, for the **πτωχεία** of Jesus Christ *by* which we are "made rich" is not the mere hardship and penury of His outward lot, but the state which He assumed in becoming man.

Ver. 10. **καὶ γνώμην κ.τ.λ.**: *and herein I give my opinion, for this* (*i.e.*, that he should offer them an opinion rather than give a command in this matter, *cf.* ix. 2) *is better, i.e.*, is morally profitable, *for you, inasmuch as you* (see Rom. i. 25, 32, etc., for **οἵτινες** = *quippe qui*) *were the first to make a beginning last year, sc.*, they began to make the collection before the Macedonian Churches did (*cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 1, chap. ix. 2), *not only to do but also to will, sc.*, they were beforehand not only in act, but in intention. **ἀπὸ πέρυσι** is for **ἐκ πέρυσι** or **πρὸ πέρυσι** of classical Greek; Deissmann (*Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 49) notes its occurrence in a papyrus of the second cent. B.C., of which the words run: **ὅτι εἰσὶν ἐν τῷ κεραμεῖ ἀπὸ πέρυσι ⳗ ιβ κ.τ.λ.**, *i.e.*, "that twelve drachmae are in the pot *from last year*". This parallel is important, as showing that **ἀπὸ πέρυσι** does not necessarily mean "a year ago". It must be borne in mind that St. Paul is writing from Macedonia and probably in the month of November. Now the Macedonian year, like the Jewish, began with October, so that the phrase would be strictly justifiable, according to the chronological scheme adopted in the *Introd.* (p. 13).

Ver. 11. **νυνὶ δὲ κ.τ.λ.**: *but now complete the doing also, that as there was the readiness to will, so there may be also the completion in accordance with your ability*: **ἐκ τοῦ ἐχεῖν** = **καθὸ ἂν ἔχῃ** of ver. 12 = *pro facultatibus* (*cf.* John iii. 34, **ἐκ μέτρου**), and not, as A.V., "out of that which ye have".

Ver. 12. **εἰ γὰρ ἡ προθυμία κ.τ.λ.**: *for if the readiness is there it is acceptable according as a man has, not according as he has not; cf.* ix. 7, Mark xii. 43, and Tobit iv. 8, "As thy substance is, give alms of it according to thine abundance; if thou have little, be not afraid to give alms according to that little".

Vv. 13, 14. **οὐ γὰρ ἵνα κ.τ.λ.**: *for* the collection is *not* made in order *that there may be relief to others, i.e.*, to the Judæan Christians, *and pressure to you, but by*

l 1 Cor. xvi. 1 17; chaps. ix. 12, xi. 9; Phil. ii. 30.
m Exod. xvi. 18.
n Here only.
o Reff. ii. 14.
p Reff. vii. 11.
q Ver. 22; *cf.* Phil. ii. 28; 2 Tim. i. 17.
r Ver. 3 only.
s Ver. 22 only.
t Rom. ii. 29, xiii. 3; 1 Cor. iv. 5; Phil. iv. 8.

ὑστέρημα, 14. ἵνα καὶ τὸ ἐκείνων περίσσευμα γένηται εἰς τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστέρημα· ὅπως γένηται ἰσότης, 15. καθὼς γέγραπται, [m] "Ὁ τὸ πολὺ, οὐκ ἐπλεόνασε· καὶ ὁ τὸ ὀλίγον οὐκ [n] ἠλαττόνησε".

16. [o] Χάρις δὲ [o] τῷ [o] Θεῷ τῷ διδόντι[1] τὴν αὐτὴν [p] σπουδὴν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ Τίτου· 17. ὅτι τὴν μὲν παράκλησιν ἐδέξατο, [q] σπουδαιότερος δὲ ὑπάρχων, [r] αὐθαίρετος ἐξῆλθε πρὸς ὑμᾶς. 18. [s] Συνεπέμψαμεν δὲ μετ'[2] αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀδελφὸν, οὗ ὁ[3] [t] ἔπαινος ἐν τῷ

[1] ℵ*BCKP, g read διδοντι; δοντι is read by ℵcDEGL, d, e, f, vg. and the Syriac; C and the Bohairic add ημιν (through misunderstanding the sense).

[2] Tisch. reads τον αδελφον μετ' αυτου with ℵ*P and the Bohairic; but the rec. order is supported by *all* the other principal MSS. and vss.

[3] F* om. ο.

equality, your abundance at the present season being a supply *for their want, that their abundance also may prove to be* a supply *for your want, sc.*, at some future time, *that there may be equality, i.e.*, reciprocity. There is no thought here of Jerusalem giving *spiritual* benefits in return for the *material* benefits given by Corinth (*cf.* chap. ix. 14 and Rom. xv. 27); what is meant is that if it ever came to the turn of Corinth to be poor, then it would be for Jerusalem to contribute for *her* support. Such an idea as that of the transference of the merits of the saints is, of course, quite foreign to the context.

Ver. 15. **καθὼς γέγραπται κ.τ.λ.**: *as it is written, sc.*, in the words of Scripture, "*He that* gathered (we must understand **σύλλεξας** from Exod. xvi. 17) *much had nothing over; and he that* gathered *little had no lack*," *sc.*, because each gathered enough manna for his own needs and no more. That each Christian Church may have enough for its *necessities*, not its *luxuries*, is what St. Paul contemplates as desirable and possible by mutual generosity in giving. The true text (ABF) of the LXX in Exod. xvi. 18 has **τὸ ἔλαττον** for **τὸ ὀλίγον**, which however is found as an early correction in A, and also in Philo.

Vv. 16-24. He commends to them Titus and two unnamed Companions, who, bearing this Letter with them, are sent to gather the Collection at Corinth.—Ver. 16. **χάρις δὲ τῷ Θεῷ κ.τ.λ.**: *but thanks be to God, who gives* (note the pres. tense) *to* (lit., "in"; see on i. 22 for constr.) *the heart of Titus the same earnest care for you, sc.*, the same that I myself feel.

Ver. 17. **ὅτι τὴν μὲν παράκλ. κ.τ.λ.**: *for not only did he accept* (the epistolary aorist) *our exhortation, sc.*, of ver. 6, *but* (and this is the proof of his **σπουδή**) *being himself very earnest* (we are not to press the comparative **σπουδαιότερος**; *cf.* Acts xvii. 22), *it was of his own accord that he went forth* (epist. aor.) *unto you, sc.*, from Macedonia, bearing this letter. **ὑπάρχων** is used (as at Rom. iv. 19, 1 Cor. xi. 7, chap. xii. 16, Gal. i. 14, Phil. ii. 6) instead of **ὤν**, as expressing not merely the fact that Titus was **σπουδαιότερος**, but that this was his habitual condition; "being, as he is," would convey the sense.

Ver. 18. **συνεπέμψαμεν δὲ κ.τ.λ.**: *and we have sent* (the epistolary aorist; *cf.* Acts xxiii. 30, chap. ix. 3, Phil. ii. 28, Philm. 12) *together with him the brother, sc.*, the brother whom you know (*cf.* chap. xii. 18), *whose praise in the Gospel, i.e.*, whose good repute as a labourer in the cause of the Gospel (*cf.* chap. x. 14, Phil. iv. 3, Rom. i. 9), *is throughout all the Churches, i.e.*, is spread abroad in all the Churches through which I have passed (*cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 17, xiv. 33; see xi. 28). The Patristic reference (Origen, Jerome, etc.) of these words to St. Luke is stereotyped in the Collect for St. Luke's Day, but there is hardly room for doubt that this is due to a mistaken interpretation of **εὐαγγέλιον** as signifying a *written* Gospel, rather than the "good news" of God delivered orally by the first Christian preachers. We have no positive data by which to determine which of St. Paul's contemporaries is here alluded to. It has been argued that as this unnamed "brother" is seemingly subordinate to Titus, he must not be identified with

εὐαγγελίῳ διὰ πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν· 19. [u]οὐ [u]μόνον δὲ, [u]ἀλλὰ καὶ [v]χειροτονηθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν [w]συνέκδημος ἡμῶν [1] σὺν [2] τῇ χάριτι ταύτῃ, τῇ διακονουμένῃ ὑφ' ἡμῶν πρὸς τὴν αὐτοῦ [3] τοῦ Κυρίου δόξαν, καὶ [x]προθυμίαν ὑμῶν [4]· 20. [y]στελλόμενοι τοῦτο, μή τις ἡμᾶς [z]μωμήσηται ἐν τῇ [a]ἁδρότητι ταύτῃ τῇ διακονουμένῃ ὑφ' ἡμῶν· 21. [b]προνοούμενοι [5] καλὰ οὐ μόνον ἐνώπιον Κυρίου, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐνώπιον ἀνθρώπων. 22. [c]Συνεπέμψαμεν δὲ αὐτοῖς τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν, ὃν [d]ἐδοκιμάσαμεν ἐν πολλοῖς πολλάκις [e]σπουδαῖον ὄντα, νυνὶ δὲ

u Reff. vii. 7.
v Acts xiv. 23 only.
w Acts xix. 29 only; *cf.* chap. v. 6.
x Reff. ver. 11.
y 2 Thess. iii. 6 only; *cf.* Acts xx. 20; Gal. ii. 12.
z Reff. vi. 3.
a Here only.
b Prov. iii. 4.
c Ver. 18 only.
d Reff. ver. 8.
e Reff. ver. 17.

[1] DE add **εγενετο** after **ημων**.

[2] BCP, f, vg. and the Bohairic (followed by W.H.) read **εν** for **συν**, which is found in ℵDEGKL, d, e, g and the Syriac vss.

[3] ℵ^{Dbc}EK and the Syriac vss. support **αυτου**; BCD*GL, the Latins and Bohairic omit it.

[4] **υμων** after **προθ.** is found in F and a few cursives only; **ημων** is read by all the principal uncials and vss.

[5] KL support **προνοουμενοι καλα**; C 17, 73 and Bohairic give **προν. γαρ καλα**; better **προνοουμεν γαρ καλα** with the other uncials and vss.

persons so important as (*e.g.*) Apollos or Silas; and, again, that, as he was apparently not a Macedonian (ix. 4), he cannot be any of the prominent members of the Macedonian Church (see on ver. 5 above). Trophimus the Ephesian is not impossible (see Acts xx. 4, xxi. 29), but it is idle to speculate where the evidence is so scanty. The important point about this unnamed brother is that he was selected not by St. Paul, but by the Churches who took part in the work of collecting money as their representative as is now explained.

Ver. 19. **οὐ μόνον δὲ ἀλλὰ κ.τ.λ.**: *and not only so, but who was also appointed* (**χειροτονεῖν** is, strictly, to vote by a show of hands, and hence it came to mean "to elect") *by the Churches, i.e.*, all the local congregations interested, *as our fellow traveller in the matter of this grace* (reading **ἐν**; see crit. note), *sc.*, this contribution of money (see vv. 6, 7, 1 Cor. xvi. 3), *which is being ministered by us* to exhibit *the glory of the Lord* (*cf.* iv. 15), *and our readiness*. The MS. evidence requires us to read **ἡμῶν**, but it must be confessed that **ὑμῶν** is rather what we should expect, especially as **προθυμία** in ver. 11 and in ix. 2 is applied to the Corinthians and not to St. Paul; a plausible conjecture would be **κατὰ προθυμίαν ἡμῶν** for **καὶ προθ. ἡμ.**, but the words give an intelligible sense as they stand (see Gal. ii. 10).

Ver. 20. **στελλόμενοι τοῦτο κ.τ.λ.**: *avoiding this* (**στελλέσθαι** might mean "to prepare" as at Wisd. xiv. 1, 2 Macc. v. 1, but Mal. ii. 5 and reff. make us decide for the Vulgate rendering *devitantes;* the metaphor is a naval one, of shifting sail so as to avoid an enemy's pursuit), *that any man should blame us in the matter of this bounty* (see xii. 18; **ἁδρός** = full, ripe, rich, as at 1 Kings i. 9, Job xxxiv. 19, Isa. xxxiv. 7, Jer. v. 5, and so **ἁδρότης** stands for a considerable and liberal — a "fat" — contribution) *which is being administered by us*. For the broken constr. **στελλόμενοι κ.τ.λ.** *cf.* v. 12, vii. 5.

Ver. 21. **προνοοῦμεν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**: *for "we provide things honest" not only "in the sight of the Lord," but also "in the sight of men,"* an injunction in the Proverbs which the Apostle quotes again at Rom. xii. 17. Where other people's money is in question, one cannot be too careful; and the prudence of the method pursued in this collection, whereby the contributing Churches appointed colleagues to accompany St. Paul and to check his accounts, is worthy of close imitation in the ecclesiastical finance of a later age (*cf.* vi. 3).

Ver. 22. **συνεπέμψαμεν δὲ αὐτοῖς κ.τ.λ.**: *and we have sent with them our brother, whom we have many times proved earnest in many things, but now much more earnest because of the great confidence which he has in you* (*cf.* Gal. v. 10, **πέποιθα εἰς ὑμᾶς**), *i.e.*, which was inspired by the account that Titus brought

f Reff. i. 15. **πολὺ σπουδαιότερον** [f] **πεποιθήσει πολλῇ τῇ εἰς ὑμᾶς. 23.** [g] **εἴτε**
g 1 Cor. xiii. 8, xv. 11. **ὑπὲρ Τίτου,** [h] **κοινωνὸς ἐμὸς καὶ εἰς** [1] **ὑμᾶς συνεργός· ** [g] **εἴτε ἀδελφοὶ**
h Lk. v. 10; Philm. 17; Isa. i. 23; *cf.* reff. i. 7. **ἡμῶν, ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν, δόξα Χριστοῦ.**[2] **24. Τὴν οὖν** [i] **ἔνδειξιν**
τῆς ἀγάπης ὑμῶν, καὶ ἡμῶν [k] **καυχήσεως ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν,**[3] **εἰς αὐτοὺς**
i Rom. iii. 25, 26; Phil. i. 28 only. k Reff. i. 12.

[1] DE, d, e, the Peshitto and Bohairic give **συνεργος εις υμας.**

[2] CF have **Κυριου** for **Χριστου.** [3] D*G, g give **υπερ ημων.**

of their good conduct. It is as impossible to identify this "brother" as him of ver. 18; like the first named he was an envoy of the contributing Churches (ver. 23), and further (what is not said of the first named) he was on terms of personal intimacy with St. Paul, as appears from this verse. The guess that he was Tychicus is a plausible one (see Acts xx. 4, Eph. vi. 21, Col. iv. 7, 2 Tim. iv. 12, Tit. iii. 12), but it is only a guess and is incapable of verification. A few cursives (see on xiii. 13) give the name of *Barnabas* with those of Titus and Luke in the subscription at the end of the Epistle, and this *may* represent an early tradition.

Ver. 23. **εἴτε ὑπὲρ Τίτου κ.τ.λ.**: *whether* you ask *about Titus* (*cf.* on i. 8 for this use of **ὑπέρ**), *he is my colleague and my fellow worker to you ward* (for him St. Paul will be personally responsible), *or our brethren*, they are *the envoys of Churches*, *i.e.*, they were duly **χειροτονηθέντες** (ver. 19). The term **ἀπόστολος** is generally used by St. Paul as a technical term; but occasionally, as here, and at Phil. ii. 25 (of Epaphroditus) and (possibly) at Rom. xvi. 7, he uses it in its primitive etymological meaning of "envoy" or "emissary" (*cf.* 1 Kings xiv. 6). These men are further described as **δόξα Χριστοῦ**, *the glory of Christ*, perhaps because their work is so specially *ad majorem Dei gloriam* (see ver. 19 and ix. 13).

Ver. 24. **τὴν οὖν ἔνδειξιν κ.τ.λ.**: *shew ye therefore* (if we read **ἐνδεικνύμενοι** the exhortation is indirect, as at Rom. xii. 9-21) *unto them in the face of the Churches the demonstration of your love*, *sc.*, to us (*cf.* ver. 7), *and of our glorying on your behalf*, *sc.*, my boasting of your readiness to give (*cf.* vii. 4, 14, and ix. 2, 3).

CHAPTER IX.—Vv. 1-5. HE IS CONFIDENT OF THEIR READINESS TO GIVE; BUT TITUS AND HIS COMPANIONS HAVE BEEN SENT ON, THAT THE COLLECTION MAY BE READY WHEN HE ARRIVES AT CORINTH.—Ver. 1. **περὶ μὲν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**: *for concerning the ministration to the saints*, *i.e.*, the collection (see on viii. 4), *it is superfluous* (*cf.* 2 Macc. xii. 44) *for me to write*, *sc.*, this letter (note the force of the art. before **γράφειν**), *to you*, who "were the first to make a beginning" (viii. 10). *Cf.* 1 Thess. iv. 9.

Ver. 2. **οἶδα γὰρ τὴν προθ. κ.τ.λ.**: *for I know your readiness*, *of which I glory* (for constr. *cf.* xi. 30, Prov. xxvii. 1) *on your behalf* (*cf.* vii. 14) *to the Macedonians*, *that Achaia* (not **ὑμεῖς**, he reports the actual words in which he made his boast; for "Achaia" see on i. 1) *has been prepared since last year* (see on viii. 10 above), *i.e.*, to make its contribution. It would seem that the Apostle feared that he had somewhat overstated the case, as he is evidently anxious about the Corinthian collection. The use of the present tense, **καυχῶμαι Μακεδόσιν**, shows that he is writing from Macedonia (see *Introd.*, p. 12).—**καὶ τὸ ὑμῶν ζῆλος κ.τ.λ.**: *and your zeal* (see on vii. 7) *has provoked the majority of them* (see on ii. 6), *sc.*, to contribute (*cf.* viii. 10).

Ver. 3. **ἔπεμψα δὲ τοὺς ἀδ. κ.τ.λ.** *but* (the **δέ** corresponding to **μέν** of ver. 1) *I have sent* (the epistolary aorist; *cf.* viii. 18) *the brethren* (*cf.* viii. 16-22), *that our glorying on your behalf may not be made void* (*cf.* esp. 1 Cor. ix. 15) *in this respect*, *i.e.*, in the matter of actually gathering the money, as distinct from their general readiness to be liberal (viii. 10), *in order that*, *even as I said*, *sc.*, to the Macedonians to whom he had repeatedly boasted of Corinthian generosity (ver. 2), *ye may be prepared.*

Ver. 4. **μή πως ἐὰν ἔλθωσι κ.τ.λ.**: *lest by any means*, *if there come with me any of Macedonia* (not "they of Macedonia," as A.V.; it is probably a fair inference from this verse that the unnamed "brethren" of viii. 18, 22 were not Macedonians), *and find you unprepared*, *i.e.*, with the collection still incomplete, *we—that we-say not*, *ye* (which is what he really wishes to convey to them)—*should be put to shame in this confidence*, *i.e.*, should be shamed because of our

[l]ἐνδείξασθε,[1] καὶ[2] εἰς [m]πρόσωπον τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν. IX. 1. Περὶ μὲν γὰρ τῆς διακονίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους περισσόν μοι ἐστὶ τὸ[3] γράφειν ὑμῖν. 2. οἶδα γὰρ τὴν [a]προθυμίαν ὑμῶν, ἣν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καυχῶμαι Μακεδόσιν, ὅτι Ἀχαΐα παρεσκεύασται [b]ἀπὸ [b]πέρυσι· καὶ ὁ[4] ἐξ[5] ὑμῶν [c]ζῆλος [d]ἠρέθισε [e]τοὺς [e]πλείονας. 3. ἔπεμψα[6] δὲ τοὺς ἀδελφούς, ἵνα μὴ τὸ [f]καύχημα ἡμῶν[7] τὸ[8] ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν [g]κενωθῇ, [h]ἐν τῷ [h]μέρει [h]τούτῳ· ἵνα, καθὼς ἔλεγον, παρεσκευασμένοι ἦτε· 4. μή[9] πως[10] ἐὰν[11] ἔλθωσι σὺν ἐμοὶ Μακεδόνες καὶ εὕρωσιν ὑμᾶς [i]ἀπαρασκευάστους, [k]καταισχυνθῶμεν ἡμεῖς, ἵνα μὴ λέγωμεν[12] ὑμεῖς,[13] ἐν τῇ [l]ὑποστάσει ταύτῃ τῆς[14] καυχήσεως. 5. [m]ἀναγκαῖον οὖν [m]ἡγησάμην παρακαλέσαι τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς, ἵνα [n]προέλθωσιν εἰς[15] ὑμᾶς, καὶ [o]προκαταρτίσωσι τὴν προκατηγγελμένην[16] εὐλογίαν ὑμῶν[17] ταύτην [p]ἑτοίμην

l Rom. ii 15, ix.22 Eph. ii. 7. m Reff. i. 11. a Reff. viii. 11. b Chap. viii. 10 only. c Reff. vii. 7. d Col. iii. 21 only; Prov. xix. 7. e Reff. ii. 6. f Reff. i. 14. g Rom. iv. 14; 1 Cor. i. 17, ix. 15; Phil. ii. 7 only. h Reff. iii. 10. i Here only. k Reff. vii.

14. l Chap. xi. 17; Heb. iii. 14. m Phil. ii. 25; 2 Macc. ix. 21. n Here only in Paul; *cf.* Acts xx. 5, 13. o Here only. p Chap. x. 6, 16; Tit. iii. 1.

[1] ℵCD[b]E**KLP, f, vg. the Syriac and Bohairic support **ενδειξασθε**; BD*E*G 17, d, e, g give **ενδεικνυμενοι** (preferred by Tisch.).

[2] **και** before **εις προσ.** is found in a few cursives only, and should be omitted.

[3] C 17 om. **το** before **γραφειν**; G has **του**.

[4] Better **το . . . ζηλος** with ℵB 17 (see on viii. 2).

[5] Better om. **εξ** before **υμων** with ℵBCP 17, f, vg. the Peshitto and Bohairic.

[6] DE and the Bohairic give **επεμψαμεν**.

[7] B* has **καυχημα υμων**.

[8] G, g om. **το υπερ υμων**.

[9] D*, d, e, f, g, vg. om. **πως**.

[10] BD[b] and the Peshitto om. **εαν**.

[11] D*[b]E*L, d, e and the Peshitto have **και καταισχ**.

[12] C*DEG, d, e, g give **λεγω**.

[13] B* has **λεγ. ημεις**.

[14] **της καυχησεως** is found in ℵ[c]D[c]EKLP and the Syriac vss. (from xi. 17); better om. **της καυχησεως** ℵ*BCD*G 17, vg. and the Bohairic.

[15] ℵCKL support **εις υμας**; BDEG have **προς**.

[16] KL support **προκατηγγελμενην**; better **προεπηγγελμενην** (Rom. i. 2 only) with ℵBCDEGP.

[17] D*, d, e, m, vg. om. **υμων**.

exaggerated statements. **ὑπόστασις** = *substratum* or *substance* (Heb. i. 3, xi. 1) is sometimes used in the LXX as = "ground of hope" (Ruth i. 12, Ps. xxxviii. 6, Ezek. xix. 5), and thus it came to mean "confidence," as here (see reff.).

Ver. 5. **ἀναγκαῖον οὖν ἡγησάμην κ.τ.λ.**: *therefore, sc.*, because of the reason in ver. 4, *I thought it necessary to exhort the brethren* (inasmuch as two of these "brethren" were not chosen by St. Paul, but were the delegates of the contributing Churches, the rendering "entreat" of the R.V. conveys well the meaning of **παρακαλέσαι**; but see on viii. 6) *that they should go beforehand unto you, sc.*, before the Apostle should himself arrive at Corinth, *and make up beforehand your bounty which was promised beforehand, sc.*, to the Macedonians. "Bis dat qui cito dat" is what he would impress upon the Corinthian Christians. **εὐλογία**, elsewhere used in the N.T. as = "blessing" (*e.g.*, Rom. xv. 29, 1 Cor. x. 16, Gal. iii. 14), is here = "gift," a meaning which as the rendering of בְּרָכָה it frequently has in the LXX (Gen. xxxiii. 11, etc.). "Originally the blending of the two ideas arose from the fact that every blessing or praise of God or man was in the East (as still to a great extent) accompanied by a gift' (Stanley). *Cf.* the similar ambiguity in the word **χάρις**.—**ταύτην ἑτοίμην εἶναι κ.τ.λ.**: *that*

q Rom. i. 29; Eph. iv. 19, v. 3; Col. iii. 5; 1 Thess. ii. 5.
r 1 Cor. ix. 11; Gal. vi. 7.
s Here only; *cf.* i. 13.
t Here only.
u Heb. vii. 12.
v Prov. xxii. 8.
w Reff. iv. 8.
x 1 Tim. vi. 6 only; *cf.* Phil. iv. 11.

εἶναι, οὕτως ὡς εὐλογίαν, καὶ[1] μὴ ὥσπερ[2] [q]πλεονεξίαν. 6. τοῦτο δὲ,[3] ὁ [r]σπείρων [s]φειδομένως φειδομένως καὶ [r]θερίσει· καὶ ὁ σπείρων ἐπ'[4] εὐλογίαις ἐπ'[4] εὐλογίαις καὶ[5] θερίσει. 7. ἕκαστος καθὼς [t]προαιρεῖται[6] τῇ καρδίᾳ· μὴ ἐκ λύπης ἢ [u]ἐξ [u]ἀνάγκης· [v]ἱλαρὸν γὰρ [v]δότην ἀγαπᾷ ὁ [v]Θεός. 8. δυνατὸς[7] δὲ[8] ὁ Θεὸς πᾶσαν χάριν περισσεῦσαι εἰς ὑμᾶς, ἵνα [w]ἐν [w]παντὶ πάντοτε πᾶσαν [x]αὐτάρκειαν

[1] ℵ*G, d, e, f, g, m, vg. and Peshitto om. **και** after **ευλογ.**; ins. ℵcBCDEKLP, the Harclean and Bohairic.

[2] **ως** is the true reading; **ωσπερ** is found in a few cursives only.

[3] f, m, vg. and the Bohairic supply **λεγω** after **δε**.

[4] D*G, d, e, g, m and the Bohairic give **εν ευλογίᾳ** for the first **επ. ευλ.**, and for the second D*, d, e have **εξ ευλογιας**, and G has **επ' ευλογιᾳ**.

[5] D*E om. **και**.

[6] DEKL support **προαιρειται**; G 17 have **προειρηται**; better **προηρηται** with ℵBCP.

[7] C²DbcEKLP support **δυνατος**; better **δυνατει** with ℵBC*DG*.

[8] D* and the Peshitto give **γαρ** for **δε**.

(we must supply **ὥστε** as at Col. iv. 6) *the same might be ready as a bounty* (**οὕτως ὡς** marks the *exact* mode in which the thank-offering is desired; *cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 15, iv. 1, ix. 26), *and not as an extortion, sc.*, a matter of covetous grasping on my part (*cf.* xii. 17). The A.V. rendering of **πλεονεξίαν** = "covetousness," seems to mean "niggardliness, such as a covetous man would exhibit," and this would fall in well with the verses which follow; but it is not agreeable to the general meaning of the word or to St. Paul's usage elsewhere (see reff.).

Vv. 6-11. LIBERAL GIVING IS BLESSED OF GOD.—Ver. 6. **τοῦτο δὲ, ὁ σπείρων κ.τ.λ.**: *but* (*sc.*, although I am not pressing you to give, *cf.* ver. 1) *this I say* (understanding **φημι**; *cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 29, xv. 50), *He that soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly, and he that soweth bountifully* (lit., "on the principle of bounties"; *cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 10, **ἐπ' ἐλπίδι**, for a similar dative of condition) *shall also reap bountifully*. A similar principle of spiritual husbandry is laid down in Prov. xi. 24, 25, where its application is plainly to the temporal prosperity of the "liberal soul"; *cf.* also Luke vi. 38. Here, too, this is, no doubt, the main thought (*cf.* viii. 14); but St. Paul elsewhere extends the principle to the future harvest which each soul shall reap according to its sowing (Gal. vi. 7; *cf.* chap. v. 10).

Ver. 7. **ἕκαστος καθὼς κ.τ.λ.**: *let each man give* (understanding **διδότω**) *according as he hath purposed* (note the perf.; he implies that they had already made up their minds to give. **προαίρεσις** is Aristotle's formal word in *Nic. Eth.*, iii. 3.19, for a free act of moral choice) *in his heart* (*cf.* Exod. xxv. 2, "of every man whose heart maketh him willing, ye shall take my offering"); *not grudgingly or of necessity, for* "*God loveth a cheerful giver*". In this quotation from Prov. xxii. 8, St. Paul substitutes (perhaps to avoid the cognate of **εὐλογία**) **ἀγαπᾷ** for **εὐλογεῖ**, the LXX reading as it has come down to us, but the sense is not altered. The duty of almsgiving played a large part in Hebrew ethics, and that it should be carried out ungrudgingly is often insisted on in the O.T. and Apocrypha, a point specially to be emphasised in the case of a people who have always had the repute of being over-fond of money—*e.g.*, "Thine heart shall not be grieved when thou givest unto him" (Deut. xv. 10); "Let not thine eye be envious" (Tobit iv. 7); "In every gift show a cheerful countenance" (Ecclus. xxxv. 9). These precepts St. Paul commends to the Corinthians (*cf.* Rom. xii. 8). (Note that the practice of having "all things common," which was initiated by the enthusiasm of the first converts (Acts iv. 32 ff.), did not last long; it was a noble attempt to express in outward deed the brotherhood of men as revealed in the Incarnation, but was, in fact, impracticable).

Ver. 8. **δυνατεῖ δὲ ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ.**: *and God is powerful* (see reff. xiii. 3) *to make*

ἔχοντες, περισσεύητε [y] εἰς [y] πᾶν [y] ἔργον [y] ἀγαθόν· 9. καθὼς γέγραπ- [y] 2 Tim. ii. 21.
ται, [z] "[3]Ἐσκόρπισεν, ἔδωκε τοῖς πένησιν· ἡ δικαιοσύνη αὐτοῦ μένει [z] Ps. cxii. 9. — 1129
εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα [1]". 10. ὁ δὲ [a] ἐπιχορηγῶν [b] σπέρμα [2] τῷ σπείροντι [a] Gal. iii. 5; Col. ii. 19; *cf.* Phil. i. 19.
καὶ ἄρτον εἰς βρῶσιν [c] χορηγήσαι,[3] καὶ [d] πληθύναι [3] τὸν [d] σπόρον [b] Isa. lv. 10.
ὑμῶν, καὶ αὐξήσαι [3] τὰ [e] γεννήματα [4] τῆς [e] δικαιοσύνης ὑμῶν· 11. [c] 1 Pet. iv. 11 only; Ecclus. xxxix. 33.
[f] ἐν [5] [f] παντὶ [g] πλουτιζόμενοι εἰς πᾶσαν [h] ἁπλότητα, ἥτις [6] [i] κατεργά- [d] Here only in Paul.
ζεται δι' ἡμῶν [7] [k] εὐχαριστίαν τῷ [8] Θεῷ· 12. ὅτι ἡ διακονία τῆς [e] Hos. x. 12.
[l] λειτουργίας ταύτης οὐ μόνον ἐστὶ [m] προσαναπληροῦσα τὰ [n] ὑστερή- [f] Reff. iv. 8.
ματα τῶν [o] ἁγίων, ἀλλὰ καὶ περισσεύουσα διὰ πολλῶν εὐχαριστιῶν [g] Reff. vi. 10.
[h] Reff. viii.

2. [i] Reff. iv. 17. [k] Reff. iv. 15. [l] Phil. ii. 17, 30. [m] Chap. xi. 9 only. [n] Reff. viii. 13. [o] Reff. i. 1.

[1] GK, f, g add **του αιωνος** at end.

[2] ℵCD[b]c EKLP support **σπερμα**; BD*G have **σπορον**.

[3] ℵ[c]D[c]GKL support the aorist infinitives (or optatives); better **χορηγησει . . . πληθυνει . . . αυξησει** with ℵ*BCD*P, the Latins and the Bohairic.

[4] The uncials have **γενηματα**. [5] G, g read **ινα εν παντι**.

[6] D* has **ει τις** for **ητις**. [7] C[2]P, g* and the Harclean margin give **δι' υμων**.

[8] D* om. **τω**; B has **ευχαρ. Θεου**.

all grace, i.e., every gift, temporal as well as spiritual, *abound unto you* (see reff. iv. 15 for **περισσεύω** in a transitive signification), *in order that ye, having always all sufficiency, sc.*, of worldly goods and gifts (for **πᾶσαν** see reff. viii. 7), *may abound unto every good work*. Note the paronomasia, **ἐν παντὶ, πάντοτε, πᾶσαν . . . περισσεύητε . . . πᾶν**.

Vv. 9 and 10 are parenthetical, containing an illustrative quotation and its application.—Ver. 9. **καθὼς γέγραπται "Ἐσκόρπισεν κ.τ.λ.**: *as it is written, sc.*, in the words of Scripture (perhaps the quotation was suggested by the image of sowing and reaping which recalled the word **ἐσκόρπισεν**), "*He, sc.*, the liberal man, *hath scattered abroad* (*cf.* Prov. xi. 24), *he hath given to the poor, his righteousness, i.e.*, his beneficence (as at Matt. vi. 1; St. Paul, when using his own words, *never* uses **δικαιοσύνη** in this old Hebrew sense), *endureth for ever*."

Ver. 10. **ὁ δὲ ἐπιχορηγῶν "σπέρμα τῷ σπείροντι κ.τ.λ.**: *and he that supplieth "seed to the sower and bread for food," shall supply and multiply your seed, i.e.*, your means of giving, *for sowing* (the A.V. not only follows the inferior reading, but conceals the quotation from Isa. lv. 10), *and increase* (*cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 6 for the trans. use of **αὐξάνω**) *the "fruits" of your "righteousness," i.e.*, of your beneficence, as in the preceding verse. The phrase **γενήματα δικαιοσύνης** in ref. Hosea may be illustrated by **τὸ γένημα τῆς ἀμπέλου**, "the fruit of the vine" in the Gospels (*e.g.*, Mark xiv. 25). This verse is the application, as it were, of the quotation in ver. 9, the connecting link being the word **δικαιοσύνη**.

Ver. 11. He now resumes the general subject of ver. 8, **ἐν παντὶ πλουτιζόμενοι** here being in apposition with **ἐν παντὶ . . . ἔχοντες** there; there is thus no necessity to treat **πλουτιζ.** as a *nom. pendens*.—**ἐν παντὶ πλουτιζόμενοι κ.τ.λ.**: *ye being enriched in everything unto all, i.e.*, all kinds of, *liberality, which worketh through us* (he goes on in the next verse to explain how this is) *thanksgiving unto God; cf.* i. 11, iv. 15.

Vv. 12-15. Liberal giving will call forth the Blessings of the Recipients.—Ver. 12. **ὅτι ἡ διακ. τῆς λειτ. κ.τ.λ.**: *for the ministration of this service* (**λειτουργία**, which originally stood for any public service, came to be restricted to the service of God; **λειτουργέω** is used in Rom. xv. 27 of this very contribution; *cf.* Num. viii. 22, Heb. viii. 6, ix. 21) *is not only filling up* (note the constr. **ἐστι** with a participle) *the wants of the saints, but is abounding also through many thanksgivings unto God* (*cf.* iv. 15).

Ver. 13. **διὰ τῆς δοκιμῆς τῆς διακ. κ.τ.λ.**: *inasmuch as they, i.e.*, the Judæan Christians, *through the proof, sc.*, of you, *afforded by this ministration* (*cf.* viii. 2 for a similar gen. after **δοκιμή**), *glorify God* (*cf.* Matt. v. 16, 1 Pet. ii. 12) *for the obedience of your confession in regard to*

τῷ[1] Θεῷ· 13. διὰ[2] τῆς [p]δοκιμῆς τῆς διακονίας ταύτης δοξάζοντες
[p] Reff. ii. 9. [q] Gal. ii. 5; 1 Tim. ii. 11, iii. 4. [r] 1 Tim. vi. 12; Heb. iii. 1, iv. 14, x. 23 only. [s] Reff. viii. 2. [t] Reff. vi. 14. [u] Reff. v. 2.
τὸν Θεὸν ἐπὶ τῇ [q]ὑποταγῇ τῆς [r]ὁμολογίας ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον
τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ [s]ἁπλότητι τῆς [t]κοινωνίας εἰς αὐτοὺς καὶ εἰς πάντας,
14. καὶ αὐτῶν δεήσει ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν,[3] [u]ἐπιποθούντων ὑμᾶς διὰ τὴν [v]ὑπερ-
βάλλουσαν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐφ' ὑμῖν. 15. [w]χάρις δὲ[4] [w]τῷ [w]Θεῷ
ἐπὶ τῇ [x]ἀνεκδιηγήτῳ αὐτοῦ [y]δωρεᾷ.
[v] Reff. iii. 10. [w] Reff. ii. 14. [x] Here only. [y] Rom. v. 15, 17; Eph. iii. 7, iv. 7.

[1] B has Χριστῳ for Θεῳ. [2] B has καιδια. [3] BE have υπερ ημων.
[4] ℵcC2DbcEKLP, the Syriac and Bohairic vss. give δε after χαρις; om. ℵ*BC*D*G 17 and the Latins.

the Gospel of Christ (*cf.* ii. 12). The sentence is an anacoluthon; **δοξάζοντες** cannot be taken as in apposition with **πλουτιζόμενοι** of ver. 11, for the persons referred to are different. It would be grammatically admissible to take **δοξάζ. τὸν Θεὸν** with **εἰς τὸ εὐαγγ. τοῦ Χρ.**, but the order of words and the sense both support the connexion **ὁμολογίας εἰς κ.τ.λ.** Of the A.V. "by the experiment of this ministration they glorify God for your professed subjection unto the Gospel of Christ" Lightfoot truly remarks that "a concurrence of Latinisms obscures the sense and mars the English". The contribution of money for the relief of the Christian poor is a **ὁμολογία**, inasmuch as it is the manifestation to the world of belief in Christ's Gospel; **ὁμολογία** is a "confession" or "vow," and so (as in Deut. xii. 17, Amos iv. 5) = "a free will offering".—**καὶ ἁπλότητι τῆς κοινωνίας κ.τ.λ.**: *and for the liberality of your contribution unto them and unto all.* This would suggest that the rich Corinthian Church had been liberal to other Churches besides that of Jerusalem, but we have no knowledge of anything of the sort.

Ver. 14. **καὶ αὐτῶν δεήσει κ.τ.λ.** This is again an independent sentence, beginning with a gen. abs.: *while they also, with supplication on your behalf, long after you* (*sc.*, apparently, long to see you) *by reason of the exceeding grace of God upon you; i.e.*, you have the prayers of those whom you are helping, who feel the yearnings of affection for their benefactors in whom the working of God's grace has been so signally displayed.

Ver. 15. **χαρὶς τῷ Θεῷ κ.τ.λ.**: *thanks be to God for His unspeakable gift.* **δωρεά** is always in the N.T. (see reff., etc.) used of the gifts of God, not of men; and the "unspeakable" gift (*cf.* Rom. xi. 33, Eph. iii. 20) for which the Apostle bursts out here into a characteristic doxology is the gift of Christ Himself (John iii. 16) and of salvation in Him, thankful appreciation of which had borne such fruit in Christian lives.

III. The Vindication of his Apostolic Authority. It would appear that while Titus had brought favourable news as to the loyalty with which the Corinthians had received St. Paul's message of reproof in the matter of the incestuous person (vii. 9-11), he had also brought distressing intelligence as to the depreciation of the Apostle's authority by certain active Judaisers at Corinth. The case is so serious that it requires immediate attention, and the third (and last) section of the latter is occupied with St. Paul's reply in vindication of his claims. See *Introd.*, p. 22.

CHAPTER X.—Vv. 1-6. HE BEGS THEM NOT TO FORCE HIM TO EXERT HIS AUTHORITY WITH SEVERITY WHEN HE COMES. He first expresses the hope that their conduct will be such as to admit of his being "meek and gentle" when he arrives at Corinth, of his coming in a "spirit of meekness," and not "with a rod" (1 Cor. iv. 21).—Ver. 1. **αὐτὸς δὲ ἐγὼ Παῦλος κ.τ.λ.**: *now* (**δέ** marks a transition to a new subject, as at viii. 1, 1 Cor. xv. 1) *I Paul myself* (**αὐτὸς ἐγώ**, calling attention to a specially personal matter as at xii. 13, Rom. ix. 3, xv. 14; he writes **ἐγὼ Παῦλος** elsewhere at Gal. v. 2, Eph. iii. 1, Philm. 19 only, for the sake of emphasis) *entreat you* (*cf.* i. 4, and for the constr. **παρακαλῶ διὰ** *cf.* Rom. xii. 1, xv. 30, 1 Cor. i. 10; the **πραΰτης καὶ ἐπιείκεια τοῦ Χρ.** are the example which gives point to the entreaty or exhortation) *by the meekness and gentleness of the Christ.* That the Messianic King should be **πραΰς** had been declared by Zechariah (ix. 9, cited Matt. xxi. 5), while **πραΰτης** had been associated with His royal pro-

X. 1. **ΑΥΤΟΣ δὲ ἐγὼ Παῦλος παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς διὰ τῆς** [a]**πραότητος** [1] **καὶ** [b]**ἐπιεικείας τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃς** [c]**κατὰ** [c]**πρόσωπον μὲν** [d]**ταπεινὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀπὼν δὲ** [e]**θαῤῥῶ εἰς** [2] **ὑμᾶς· 2.** [f]**δέομαι δὲ, τὸ μὴ παρὼν θαρρῆσαι τῇ** [g]**πεποιθήσει** [3] **ᾗ λογίζομαι** [h]**τολμῆσαι ἐπί τινας τοὺς λογιζομένους ἡμᾶς ὡς** [i]**κατὰ** [i]**σάρκα** [i]**περιπατοῦντας. 3.** [k]**ἐν** [k]**σαρκὶ γὰρ περιπατοῦντες, οὐ κατὰ σάρκα** [l]**στρατευόμεθα· 4. (τὰ γὰρ ὅπλα τῆς** [m]**στρατείας ἡμῶν οὐ σαρκικὰ, ἀλλὰ δυνατὰ τῷ Θεῷ πρὸς** [n]**καθαίρεσιν** [o]**ὀχυρωμάτων·) 5.** [p]**λογισμοὺς καθαιροῦντες καὶ πᾶν** [q]**ὕψωμα** [r]**ἐπαιρόμενον κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ** [4] [s]**αἰχμαλωτίζοντες πᾶν** [t]**νόημα**

a 1 Cor. iv. 21; Gal. v. 23; Eph. iv. 2; Col. iii. 12.
b Acts xxiv. 4 only; *cf.* Phil. iv. 5; 1 Tim. iii. 3; Jas. iii. 17.
c Acts iii. 13, xxv. 16.
d Reff. vii. 6.
e Reff. v. 6.
f Reff. v. 20.
g Reff. i. 15.
h 1 Cor. vi. 1; chap. xi. 21, etc.
i Rom. viii. 4; *cf.* reff. i. 17.
k Gal. ii. 20; Phil. i. 22; Col. ii. 1, etc.
l 1 Cor. ix. 7; 1 Tim. i. 18; 2 Tim. ii. 4.
m 1 Tim. i. 18 only.
n Ver. 8, chap. xiii. 10 only.
o Here only.
p Rom. ii. 15 only; Prov. vi. 18.
q Rom. viii. 39 only.
r Chap. xi. 20; Ezra iv. 19.
s Lk. xxi. 24; Rom. vii. 23; 2 Tim. iii. 6 only.
t Reff. ii. 11.

[1] The better spelling is **πραυτητος** with ℵ*BGP 17.

[2] P and the Latins give **εν υμιν** for **εις υμας.**

[3] C[2] and the Bohairic add **ταυτῃ** (*cf.* i. 15) after **τῃ πεπ.**

[4] G, d, e, g, m om. **και.**

gress by the Psalmist (Ps. xliv. 5); and Christ, when He came, declared that he was **πραὺς καὶ ταπεινὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ,** a claim which His life on earth abundantly exemplified (*cf.* Matt. xii. 19, Luke xxiii. 34). So too in the wonderful portrait of the Righteous Man in Wisd. ii. 12 ff., **ἐπιείκεια,** "gentleness," "sweet reasonableness," is one of the qualities mentioned (ver. 19). In Greek Ethics (*e.g.*, Aristotle, *Nic. Eth.*, v., 10) the **ἐπιεικής** is the "equitable" man, who does not press for the last farthing of his rights (see reff.). St. Paul alludes to these qualities as well known to have belonged to the character of Jesus, even as they had been foretold of the Messiah.—**ὃς κατὰ πρόσωπον κ.τ.λ.**: I Paul, *who indeed* (*sc.*, as you say by way of reproach, the concessive **μέν**) *before your face am lowly among you* (he had admitted this before, 1 Cor. ii. 3 and chap. vii. 6, and the lowliness of his demeanour had been made the subject of adverse comment, see further ver. 10), *but being absent am of good courage towards you, i.e.*, am outspoken in rebuke of you (a quite different phrase from **θαρρῶ ἐν ὑμῖν** of vii. 16).

Ver. 2. **δέομαι δὲ τὸ μὴ παρὼν κ.τ.λ.**: *nay* (*sc.*, "however that be," **δέ** recommencing the sentence) *I beseech you, that I may not* (the use of the article with **μή** and the inf. is somewhat unusual; but *cf.* ii. 1, Rom. xiv. 13; **τὸ** adds emphasis to the thing asked), *when present, shew courage with the confidence* (almost = "peremptoriness") *wherewith I count on myself* (mid., not passive) *to be bold against some* (for the vague **τινες** see on iii. 1) *which count of us as if we walked according to the flesh.* His opponents charged him with low motives (*cf.* ii. 17) which he will indignantly and sternly repudiate.

Ver. 3. **ἐν σαρκὶ γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**: *for though we walk in the flesh, sc.*, as all men must do (see reff.), *we do not war, i.e.*, carry on our campaign against evil and the enemies of God, *according to the flesh* (*cf.* John xvii. 15)—*for the weapons of our warfare* (see on vi. 7) *are not carnal* (see on i. 12), *but are mighty before God, i.e.*, in God's sight, in His estimation (or, perhaps, "*exceeding* mighty," which is the force of **τῷ Θεῷ** at Jonah iii. 3, Acts vii. 20; the A.V. "mighty through God," *i.e.*, "by His aid," cannot be right), *to the casting down of strongholds*, which is the ultimate object of every campaign, and which, being achieved, is the seal of victory; **καθαίρειν τὰ ὀχυρώματα** is the regular LXX phrase for the reduction of a fortress (see Prov. xxi. 22, Lam. ii. 2, 1 Macc. v. 65, viii. 10).

Ver. 4 is an explanatory parenthesis, and the constr. of ver. 5 is continuous with ver. 3, the metaphor of the destruction of the citadel being carried on.

Ver. 5. **λογισμοὺς καθαιροῦντες κ.τ.λ.**: *casting down*, as if they were centres of the enemy's force, *reasonings* (St. Paul's message, as he told the Corinthians at 1 Cor. ii. 4 was not **ἐν πειθοῖς σοφίας λόγοις,** but "in demonstration of the

u Reff. ix. 5.
v Rom. xii. 19; *cf.* vii. 11.
w Rom. v. 19; Heb. ii. 2 only.
x Reff. ver. 1.

εἰς τὴν ὑπακοὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ,[1] 6. καὶ ἐν[2] [u]ἑτοίμῳ ἔχοντες [v]ἐκδικῆσαι
πᾶσαν [w]παρακοήν, ὅταν πληρωθῇ[3] ὑμῶν[4] ἡ ὑπακοή.
7. τὰ [x]κατὰ [x]πρόσωπον βλέπετε; εἴ τις πέποιθεν[5] ἑαυτῷ Χριστοῦ[6]
εἶναι, τοῦτο λογιζέσθω πάλιν ἀφ'[7] ἑαυτοῦ, ὅτι καθὼς αὐτὸς Χριστοῦ,

[1] After **Χρ.** D*EG, d, e, g, m add **αγοντες.**

[2] D* has **ετοιμως** for **εν ετοιμῳ.** [3] C, r add **προτερον** after **πληρ.**

[4] D*cEG, d, e, g, r give the order **η υπακ. υμων.**

[5] B has **δοκει πεποιθεναι.** [6] D*E*G, d, e, f, g supply **δουλος** after **Χρ.**

[7] **αφ εαυτου** is found in CDEGKP (*cf.* iii. 5); better **εφ'** with ℵBL and the Latins.

Spirit and of power"; he ever regards the Gospel as a *revelation*, not a body of doctrine which could be reasoned out by man for himself from first principles—not, to be sure, an irrational system, but one which is beyond the capacity of reason to discover or to fathom to its depths), *and every high thing* (carrying on the metaphor by which the "towering" conceits of speculation are represented as fortifications erected against the soldiers of the Cross) *that is exalted*, or "elevated," "built up," *against the knowledge of God, sc.*, which is revealed in Christ, *and leading captive* (for **αἰχμαλωτίζειν** the more correct Attic form is **αἰχμαλωτεύειν**) *every thought into the obedience of Christ* (*cf.* ix. 13). All through this passage the Apostle has directly in view the opposition of gainsayers at Corinth, and so it is not safe to interpret his phrases as directed without qualification against the claims of the intellect and conscience in the matter of doctrine. Yet it must be remembered that he regarded the message which he preached as directly revealed to himself, and not derived from tradition or interpretation, and hence as possessed of a certainty to which the demonstrations of philosophy, however cogent, could not attain. All Truth must be loyal to "the obedience of Christ," who was Himself "the Truth" (*cf.* xiii. 8).

Ver. 6. **καὶ ἐν ἑτοίμῳ ἔχοντες κ.τ.λ.**: *and being in readiness* (*cf.* **ἑτοίμως ἔχω** chap. xii. 14) *to avenge all disobedience* (*cf.* Matt. xviii. 17), *sc.*, if there remain any still disobedient, *when your obedience, i.e.*, to me and to my Apostolic authority (*cf.* ii. 9, vii. 15), *shall be fulfilled*. The word **ὑπακοή** in ver. 5 brings him back to this, the primary object of his letter. He does not wish to arrive in Corinth until the Church as a whole is firm in its loyalty to him.

Vv. 7-18. DESPITE ALL APPEARANCES, HIS APOSTOLICAL AUTHORITY IS WEIGHTY; HIS MISSION TO THE GREEKS IS A DIVINE TRUST.—Ver. 7. **τὰ κατὰ προσ. κ.τ.λ.**: *ye look at the things which are before your face; i.e.*, you pay too much attention to outward appearances (*cf.* Rom. ii. 11, Gal. ii. 6, Eph. vi. 9), you lay too much stress on personal intimacy with Christ in the flesh (v. 7), and on a man's bodily presence and powers of speech (ver. 10), even on his own self-commendation (ver. 12). The rec. text places a note of interrogation after **βλέπετε**, but it seems preferable to treat the sentence as a simple categorical statement (see esp. on ver. 12, and *cf.* John vii. 24).—**εἴ τις πέποιθεν κ.τ.λ.**: *if any man* (this is his usual vague way of referring to opponents; *cf.* xi. 4, 20) *trusteth in himself that he is Christ's*, prides himself on specially belonging to what he regards as the "party" of Christ, which had unhappily grown up at Corinth (1 Cor. i. 12), *let him consider this again* (he has often heard it before, but has forgotten it) *with himself* (or, reading **ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ**, "let him think this out for himself"—it does not need any prompting from without), *that even as he is Christ's, so also are we* (1 Cor. iii. 23).

Ver. 8. **ἐάν τε γὰρ καὶ περισσότερόν κ.τ.λ.**: *for even if I should glory somewhat abundantly* (or, perhaps, "somewhat *more* abundantly," *sc.*, than I have already done in vv. 3-6; but the comparative need not be pressed; *cf.* ii. 4), *concerning our authority* (*which the Lord gave for building you up, and not for casting you down*), *I shall not be put to shame, i.e.*, my confident words can be amply justified. He returns here to the image of ver. 4; his authority (and he repeats this again in the same words at xiii. 10) extends not solely or chiefly to the overthrow of the fortresses of mis-

οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς Χριστοῦ.[1] 8. ἐάν τε[2] γὰρ καὶ[3] περισσότερόν τι καυχήσωμαι[4] περὶ τῆς [y]ἐξουσίας ἡμῶν,[5] ἧς ἔδωκεν ὁ Κύριος ἡμῖν[6] εἰς [z]οἰκοδομὴν καὶ οὐκ εἰς [a]καθαίρεσιν ὑμῶν, οὐκ [b]αἰσχυνθήσομαι· 9. ἵνα μὴ δόξω[7] ὡς ἂν [c]ἐκφοβεῖν[8] ὑμᾶς διὰ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν. 10. ὅτι αἱ μὲν[9] ἐπιστολαί, φησὶ,[10] [d]βαρεῖαι καὶ [e]ἰσχυραί· ἡ δὲ [f]παρουσία τοῦ σώματος ἀσθενὴς, καὶ ὁ λόγος [g]ἐξουθενημένος· 11. τοῦτο λογιζέσθω ὁ [h]τοιοῦτος, ὅτι οἷοί ἐσμεν τῷ [i]λόγῳ δι' ἐπιστολῶν ἀπόντες, τοιοῦτοι καὶ παρόντες τῷ [i]ἔργῳ.

y Chap. xiii. 10; 1 Cor. ix. 4, etc.
z Chaps. xii. 19, xiii. 10; 1 Cor. xiv. 26, etc.
a Reff. ver. 4.
b Phil. i. 20.
c Here only.
d Acts xxv. 7; 1 John v. 3.
e 1 Cor. i. 25, 27, iv. 10, x. 22.
f Reff. vii. 6.
g Rom. xiv. 10; 1 Cor. vi. 4; Gal. iv. 14.
h Reff. ii. 6.
i Rom. xv. 18; Col. iii. 17.

[1] DcEKL and the Bohairic support **Χριστου** after **ημεις**, but all the other principal authorities omit it.

[2] BG 17 and (perhaps) d, e, g, the Peshitto and Bohairic omit **τε** after **εαν**.

[3] ℵcDcE**L, the Peshitto and Harclean margin support **και** after **γαρ**; om. **και** ℵ*BC̄D*E*GP, the Latins, Bohairic and Harclean text.

[4] BCDEK, followed by W.H., support **καυχησωμαι**; Tisch. reads **καυχησομαι** with ℵLP.

[5] C*P, the Peshitto and Bohairic omit **ημων**.

[6] **ημιν** is found in DcEGKL (P 73, f and the Harclean have **ημιν ο κυρ.**); om. **ημιν** ℵ*BCD* 17, d, e.

[7] D*EG, d, e, g give **δοξωμεν**.

[8] DE, d, e, g give **εκφοβουντες**.

[9] Better **αι επιστ. μεν** with ℵ*B, r.

[10] ℵDEGKLP, d, e, and the Bohairic have **φησιν**, which is also preferred by W.H.; B, f, g, r, vg. and the Syriac support **φασιν**.

guided imagination, but also to the positive and more congenial work of construction, of "building up" (*cf.* Jer. i. 10).

Ver. 9. **ἵνα μὴ δόξω κ.τ.λ.**: *that I may not seem as if I would scare you by my letters.* It is best to take these words with **εἰς οἰκοδομήν** of the preceding verse; his purpose in writing so severely is not to terrify them, but to build them up in holiness and obedience. **ὡς ἄν** = *tanquam*, with the infin. is only found here in the N.T. The plural **τῶν ἐπιστολῶν** suggests (what we know from 1 Cor. v. 9) that at least one letter of rebuke in addition to 1 *Cor.* had been written before this.

Ver. 10. **ὅτι αἱ ἐπιστολαὶ μὲν, φασὶν κ.τ.λ.**: *for "his letters" they say "are weighty and powerful but,"* etc. The reading is doubtful (see crit. note); if we follow the rec. text **φησίν** = "one says" or "he says" (*cf.* Wisd. xv. 12), the reference will be to an individual opponent (the **τοιοῦτος** of ver. 11) who would be readily recognised by the Corinthians; but we must then suppose **τις** to have dropped out. It is simpler therefore to read **φασίν** with the A.V. and R.V., and to take the words as reproducing the charge against the Apostle commonly made by those who were disaffected at Corinth. They are "remarkable as giving a contemporary judgment on his Epistles, and a personal description of himself" (Stanley).—**ἡ δὲ παρουσία τοῦ σώματος κ.τ.λ.**: "*but his bodily presence is weak* (see chap. xii. 7, Gal. iv. 14, and Acts xiv. 12, where the Lystrans called Barnabas "Zeus," and evidently therefore counted him as of more dignified presence than his companion) *and his speech contemptible*"; *cf.* 1 Cor. i. 17. Persuasive speaker as St. Paul must have been (the Lystrans called him Hermes as "the chief speaker"), he probably had not the arts of a trained rhetorician (1 Cor. i. 17, ii. 1, 4, chap. xi. 6), and this would appear a grave defect to these clever and shallow Greeks. According to the second century *Acts of Paul and Thecla* (§ 3) the Apostle was a low-sized man, bow-legged, of a healthy complexion, with eyebrows knit together (the Armenian version adds that his eyes were blue), and an aquiline nose. The description of him in the piece called *Philopatris* (§ 13), ascribed to Lucian, is very similar.

k Refl. ver. 2.
l Here only.
m 1 Cor. ii. 13 only.
n Refl. iii. 1.
o Here only in Paul.
p Rom. xv. 21; Eph. v. 17.
q Ver. 15 only.
r Rom. xii. 3; Eph. iv. 7.
s Vv. 15, 16; Gal. vi. 16; Phil. iii. 16 only.
t Rom. xii. 3; 1 Cor. vii. 17.
u Here only.
v Matt. xii. 28; Rom. ix. 31; Phil. iii. 16; 1 Thess. ii. 16.

12. Οὐ γὰρ [k]τολμῶμεν[1] [l]ἐγκρῖναι[2] ἢ [m]συγκρῖναι ἑαυτούς τισι τῶν [n]ἑαυτοὺς [n]συνιστανόντων· ἀλλὰ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἑαυτοὺς[3] [o]μετροῦντες, καὶ συγκρίνοντες ἑαυτοὺς ἑαυτοῖς, οὐ [p]συνιοῦσιν.[4] 13. ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐχὶ εἰς τὰ[5] [q]ἄμετρα καυχησόμεθα,[6] ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ [r]μέτρον τοῦ [s]κανόνος οὗ[7] [t]ἐμέρισεν[1] ἡμῖν[8] ὁ [t]Θεὸς[9] μέτρου, [u]ἐφικέσθαι[10] ἄχρι καὶ ὑμῶν. 14. οὐ[11] γὰρ ὡς μὴ ἐφικνούμενοι[12] εἰς ὑμᾶς [u]ὑπερεκτείνομεν ἑαυτούς· ἄχρι γὰρ[13] καὶ ὑμῶν [v]ἐφθάσαμεν ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ

[1] B has τολμω.
[2] G has κριναι; DE add εαυτους.
[3] ℵ* om. εαυτους before μετρ.; DEK 73 have εαυτους εαυτοις.
[4] DcEKLP support συνιουσιν; better συνιασιν with ℵaB 17, 37; ℵ* has συνισασιν; om. ου συν. ημεις δε D*G, d, e, f, g (see note below).
[5] D*G and the Latins give εις το αμετρον.
[6] G, f, g give καυχωμενοι; om. καυχ. D*, d, e.
[7] M 67**, d, e, f, g, vg. give οσου εμετρησεν.
[8] GL, g, om. ημιν.
[9] DE, d, e give Κυριος.
[10] DE have αφικεσθαι.
[11] P has ου γαρ μη ως; B has simply ως γαρ μη, which W.H. place in their margin.
[12] K has αφικνουμενοι; G, αφικομενοι.
[13] ℵ* om. γαρ after αχρι.

Ver. 11. **τοῦτο λογιζέσθω κ.τ.λ.**: *let such an one, sc.*, as makes comments of the kind just quoted, *reckon this, that* (*cf.* constr. ver. 7) *what we are in word by letters when we are absent, such are we also in deed when we are present.*

Ver. 12. **οὐ γὰρ τολμῶμεν κ.τ.λ.**: *for we do not venture* (an ironical refusal to put himself on a level with his adversaries, whose shallow pretensions he thus quietly exposes) *to number or compare ourselves* (note the paronomasia in the Greek) *with certain of them that commend themselves* (the charge made against *him*—see on iii. 1—he retorts with great effect on his opponents); *but they themselves measuring themselves by themselves and comparing themselves with themselves are without understanding* (*cf.* Prov. xxvi. 12). This sentence is so much involved, that it is not surprising to find the Western authorities (see crit. note) giving it a quite different turn by the omission of the words **οὐ συνιοῦσιν** (or **συνιᾶσιν**) **ἡμεῖς δὲ . . . καυχησόμεθα.** Following this shorter text, the meaning would be: "but we are measuring ourselves by ourselves and comparing ourselves with ourselves, not going into spheres beyond our measure," etc. This gives a connected sense, and is favoured by the fact that the balance of the sentence leads us to expect that **αὐτοὶ** after **ἀλλὰ** shall refer to the Apostle, and not to his opponents, as it must do with the longer reading. Nevertheless we believe that the omission is simply an attempt to evade the difficulty of the true text; it would be quite unlike St. Paul to speak of *himself* as his own standard of conduct, and would not be harmonious with the thought of ver. 13. Others take **συνιοῦσιν** as a dative participle and adopt the rendering: "but we (*i.e.*, St. Paul) measure ourselves by ourselves, and compare ourselves with ourselves, unwise as we are" (*sc.*, in their opinion). This, however, is not only open to the objection just mentioned, but would require **τοῖς** before **οὐ συνιοῦσιν.** On the whole, therefore, we prefer to follow the best MS. authority by reading **συνιᾶσιν**, and to treat the Western text as an abbreviation, which misses the point of the argument in the attempt to simplify the construction.

Ver. 13. **ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐχὶ κ.τ.λ.**: *but we will not glory beyond our measure* (**εἰς τὰ** representing the direction and extent of his boasting), *but according to the measure of the rule which* (**οὗ** for **ὅν** by attraction) *God hath apportioned* (see reff.) *to us as a measure, to reach* (the infin. of purpose) *even unto you.* **κανών** is a line of direction (see reff., and *cf.* Clem. Rom., § 41, **μὴ παρεκβαίνων τὸν**

Χριστοῦ· 15. οὐκ εἰς τὰ ἄμετρα καυχώμενοι ἐν [w]ἀλλοτρίοις [x]κόποις, ἐλπίδα δὲ ἔχοντες, αὐξανομένης τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν,[1] ἐν ὑμῖν [y]μεγαλυνθῆναι κατὰ τὸν κανόνα ἡμῶν[2] εἰς [z]περισσείαν, 16. εἰς τὰ [a]ὑπερέκεινα ὑμῶν εὐαγγελίσασθαι, οὐκ ἐν ἀλλοτρίῳ κανόνι εἰς τὰ [b]ἕτοιμα καυχήσασθαι. 17. "[c]Ὁ δὲ [c]καυχώμενος ἐν [c]Κυρίῳ [c]καυχάσθω·" 18. οὐ γὰρ ὁ [d]ἑαυτὸν [d]συνιστῶν,[3] ἐκεῖνός ἐστι[4] [e]δόκιμος, ἀλλ' ὃν ὁ Κύριος συνίστησιν.

w Rom. xiv. 4, xv. 20; 1 Tim. v. 22.
x Reff. vi. 5.
y Phil. i. 20.
z Reff. viii. 2.
a Here only; *cf.* Amos v. 27.
b Reff. ix. 5.
c 1 Cor. i. 31 (Jer. ix. 24).
d Reff. iii. 1.
e Rom. xiv. 18, xvi. 10; 1 Cor. xi. 19; chap. xiii. 7; 2 Tim. ii. 15.

[1] B has ημων for υμων.

[2] ℵ has υμων for ημων.

[3] DcKL support συνιστων; better συνιστανων with ℵBD*EGMP (*cf.* crit. notes on iii. 1, iv. 2).

[4] ℵcBGKLMP, g support εστι δοκ.; but ℵ*DE, d, e, f, r, vg. give δοκιμος εστι.

ὡρισμένον τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ κανόνα), and so here represents the "province" or sphere in which St. Paul conceives himself as appointed by God to proclaim the Gospel. He especially emphasises this here; to Corinth he has a "mission," as the Apostle of the Gentiles; his authority over the Corinthian Church is not usurped, but has been divinely given him.

Ver. 14. **οὐ γὰρ ὡς μὴ κ.τ.λ.**: *for we stretch not ourselves overmuch, as though we reached not unto you* (**ὡς μή** indicating that the case is only a hypothetical one; *cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 18); *for we came* (**φθάνω** being used as in modern Greek; see reff.) *as far as unto you in the Gospel of Christ.* Corinth was the westernmost point that he had reached. This verse, it will be observed, is parenthetical, and is introduced to make it clear that Corinth was part of his appointed sphere; *cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 5, iv. 15, ix. 1.

Ver. 15. **οὐκ εἰς τὰ ἄμετρα κ.τ.λ.**: *not glorying beyond our measure* (the argument is resumed from ver. 13), *that is, in other men's labours.* This he steadily avoided (*cf.* Rom. xv. 20); even Rome itself was to be visited *en route* to Spain (Rom. xv. 24). But his Corinthian opponents were not so scrupulous about intruding into another man's sphere (1 Cor. iii. 10, iv. 15). —**ἐλπίδα δὲ ἔχ. κ.τ.λ.**: *but having hope that, as your faith groweth* (see Eph. ii. 21, iv. 15, Col. i. 10, ii. 19, for intrans. use of **αὐξάνειν**, and *cf.* chap. ix. 10), *we shall be magnified in you* (*cf.* Acts v. 13) *according to our rule, i.e.*, our 'line," our apportionment of Apostolic work, *unto further abundance, so as*, etc.

Ver. 16. **εἰς τὰ ὑπερέκεινα κ.τ.λ.**: *so as to preach the Gospel in the regions beyond you, i.e.* (if we are to press the idea of direction in **ὑπερέκεινα**), the western parts of Greece, Rome and Spain, which were "beyond," if viewed from Jerusalem, the home of Christianity, whence St. Paul, like the other early preachers, received his "mission" (more probably, however, **ὑπερέκεινα** is used quite vaguely as **ἐπέκεινα** is in Amos v. 27, where the idea of direction cannot be read into it), *and not to glory in another's "line" about things made ready to our hand.* This is what the intruders had done at Corinth, whose Church St. Paul had founded (1 Cor. iii. 6).

Ver. 17. **ὁ δὲ καυχώμενος κ.τ.λ.**: *but he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord*, a quotation from the O.T. (see reff.) used before by St. Paul (*cf.* also Rom. xv. 18, 1 Cor. iii. 7). *For not he that commendeth himself is approved* (*cf.* Prov. xxvii. 2), *but whom the Lord commendeth* (*cf.* Rom. ii. 29, 1 Cor. iv. 5). And the Corinthian Church itself is his "letter of commendation" (iii. 2).

CHAPTER XI.—Vv. 1-4. HE BEGS THEM TO BEAR WITH HIM IF HE STATES HIS CLAIMS AT LENGTH; IT IS NECESSARY TO DO SO BECAUSE OF THEIR READINESS TO ACCEPT NOVEL TEACHING.—Ver. 1. **ὄφελον ἀνείχεσθέ μου κ.τ.λ.**: *would that ye could bear with me in a little* (**μικρόν τι** only here and ver. 16; *cf.* Heb. ii. 7) *foolishness.* **ἀφροσύνη** = "nonsense" (see ref. and *cf.* Rom. ii. 20, 1 Cor. xv. 36, Eph. v. 17). He thus deprecates his insistence on his claim to apostolic authority, and at the same time introduces with great skill a passionate statement of it.—**ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνέχ. μου**: *nay indeed bear with me; i.e.*, he not only utters a wish, but entreats them directly. Others (*e.g.*, R.V. marg.) take **ἀνέχ.** as indic., *i.e.*, "but indeed ye do bear with me".

XI. 1. [a]Ὄφελον[1] ἀνείχεσθέ[2] μου μικρὸν τῇ[3] [b]ἀφροσύνῃ· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνέχεσθε[4] μου. 2. [c]ζηλῶ γὰρ ὑμᾶς Θεοῦ [d]ζήλῳ· [e]ἡρμοσάμην γὰρ ὑμᾶς ἑνὶ ἀνδρὶ, παρθένον [f]ἁγνὴν [g]παραστῆσαι τῷ Χριστῷ· 3. [h]φοβοῦμαι δὲ [h]μή[5] [h]πως, ὡς ὁ [i]ὄφις Εὔαν[6] [i]ἐξηπάτησεν ἐν[7] τῇ [k]πανουργίᾳ αὐτοῦ, οὕτω[8] [l]φθαρῇ τὰ [m]νοήματα ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς

a 1 Cor. iv. 8; Gal. v. 12.
b Vv. 17, 21; Mk. vii. 22.
c 1 Cor. xii. 31; Gal. iv. 17.
d Reff. vii. 7, 13.
e Here only.
f Reff. vii. 11.
g Reff. iv. 14.
h Chap. xii. 20; Gal. iv. 11.
i Gen. iii.
k Reff. iv. 2.
l Reff. vii. 2.
m Reff. ii. 11.

[1] DcEGKL have **ωφελον** (*cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 8); **οφελον** ℵBMP.

[2] A few minuscules have **οφελον ηνειχεσθε.**

[3] KLP support **τη αφροσυνη**; ℵBDEM 17 have (preferably) **τι αφροσυνης,** and there are minor variants.

[4] ℵ has **αλλα και ανασχεσθε.** [5] For **μηπως** G has **μηποτε** and D* has **μη.**

[6] DEKL, the Harclean, d, e, f, r, vg. support the order **Ευ. εξηπ.**; but ℵBGMP 17, g and the Bohairic give **εξηπ. Ευ.**

[7] D* omits **εν.**

[8] DbcEKLM, f, vg. and the Syriac support **ουτω φθαρη**; better om. **ουτω** (as a marginal gloss) with ℵBD*GP 17, d, e, g, r and the Bohairic.

Ver. 2. **ζηλῶ γὰρ ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ.**: *for I am jealous over you with a godly jealousy* (*cf.* Zech. i. 14, and for **Θεοῦ ζήλῳ** *cf.* Acts xxii. 3, Rom. x. 2; this "jealousy" of St. Paul is on behalf of God); *for I espoused you to one husband, that I might present you as a pure virgin to Christ, sc.*, at His Coming. The figure of Israel as a Bride presented to Jehovah as the Bridegroom was frequently used by the O.T. prophets (Isa. liv. 5, lxii. 5, Hosea ii. 19); and, according to the Rabbis, Moses was the bridesman or paranymph. Here St. Paul conceives of himself as the paranymph (*cf.* John iii. 29) who presents the Church as a pure Bride (*cf.* Rev. xxi. 2) to Christ, the heavenly Spouse, the "one husband" to whom she is bound to remain faithful. Some critics have found here an echo of Christ's words at Matt. ix. 15, xxv. 1-12; but the similarity does not extend further than the employment of the same image demands. **ἁρμόζω** in the *act.* is regularly used of the father of the bride; in the *pass.* of the bride herself (Prov. xix. 14); and in the *mid.* generally of the bridegroom, but sometimes (as here) of others.

Ver. 3. **φοβοῦμαι δὲ μή πως κ.τ.λ.**: *but I fear lest by any means, as "the serpent beguiled" Eve in his craftiness* (in Gen. iii. 1 the serpent is called **φρονιμώτατος**, but St. Paul changes the word to indicate the baseness of the serpent's wisdom. Aristotle uses **πανουργία** in direct contrast to **φρόνησις**; *cf. Nic. Eth.*, vi., 12), *your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity and the purity* (*cf.* chap. vi. 6) *that is toward Christ.* It would appear that the belief of the synagogues was that the serpent literally "seduced" Eve (*cf.* 4 Macc. xviii. 6-8, and Iren., *contra Haer.*, i., 307), and it is probably in reference to this that St. Paul substitutes the stronger word **ἐξαπατάω** (as he does at 1 Tim. ii. 14) for the simple verb **ἀπατ.** of Gen. iii. 13. Carrying on the metaphor of ver. 2, he expresses his anxiety lest the Corinthian Church, the Bride of Christ, should be seduced by the devil from her singleness of affection (*cf.* 1 Macc. ii. 37, 60, and see on viii. 2 for **ἁπλότης**) and her purity, and so should be guilty of spiritual fornication. He assumes that "the serpent" is to be identified with Satan, the tempter of mankind, as he does also at Rom. xvi. 20; the earliest trace of this identification, which has become so familiar, is Wisd. ii. 24, *cf.* Rev. xii. 9, xx. 2. He now gives the reason of his anxiety, lest they should fall away; *viz.*, they were showing themselves too willing to listen to strange teachings.

Ver. 4. **εἰ μὲν γὰρ ὁ ἐρχόμενος κ.τ.λ.**: *for if he that cometh* (**ὁ ἐρχόμενος** *may* point to some one conspicuous opponent, but it would not be safe to press this, or to lay stress on the verb as indicating one who *comes* without authorised *mission*, as at John x. 8; it is probably a quite indefinite phrase, "if any one comes and preaches," etc.) *preacheth another Jesus whom we did not preach* (*not* "another Christ," "a new Messiah," for of this the false teachers at Corinth were *not*

[n] ἁπλότητος[1] τῆς εἰς τὸν[2] Χριστόν. 4. εἰ μὲν γὰρ ὁ ἐρχόμενος [o] ἄλλον [o] Ἰησοῦν[3] [o] κηρύσσει ὃν οὐκ ἐκηρύξαμεν, ἢ πνεῦμα ἕτερον λαμβάνετε ὃ οὐκ ἐλάβετε, ἢ εὐαγγέλιον[4] ἕτερον ὃ οὐκ ἐδέξασθε, [p] καλῶς ἠνείχεσθε.[5] 5. Λογίζομαι γὰρ[6] μηδὲν [p] ὑστερηκέναι[7] τῶν [q] ὑπὲρ λίαν ἀποστόλων. 6. εἰ δὲ[8] καὶ [r] ἰδιώτης[9] τῷ λόγῳ, ἀλλ' οὐ

[n] Reff. viii. 2. [o] Acts ix. 20, xix. 13. [p] Ver. 8; Rom. iii. 23; 1 Cor. i. 7; chap. xii. 11. [q] Chap. xii. 11 only. [r] Acts iv. 13; 1 Cor. iv. 16, 23.

[1] ℵ*BG 17, g and the Harclean (with asterisk) give απο της απλοτητος και της αγνοτητος, which is adopted by W.H. and the R.V.; ℵᶜDᶜKLMP, f, vg. and the Peshitto have only απο της απλ. of the rec. text.

[2] BDEKLP support εις τον Χρ.; ℵGM omit τον.

[3] G, f, g, vg. give Χριστον for Ἰησουν. [4] G, g add λαμβανεται after ευαγγ. ετ.

[5] BD* 17 have ανεχεσθε; but ℵDᶜEGKLMP have ανειχεσθε; the rec. ηνειχεσθε is found in cursives only.

[6] B has δε for γαρ, probably in mistaken reference to μεν of ver. 4.

[7] D*E, d, e, r, etc., add εν υμιν after υστερ.

[8] D*, d, e, f, g give ει και. [9] D*E, d, e, g give ιδ. ειμι.

guilty; but "another Jesus," *i.e.*, a different representation of the historical Person, Jesus of Nazareth, from that which St. Paul put forward when at Corinth; see reff.), *or if ye receive a different Spirit which ye did not receive, sc.*, a Spirit different from Him whom you received at your baptism (**λαμβάνειν** is the regular verb with **πνεῦμα**; *cf.* John xx. 22, Acts viii. 15, x. 47, xix. 2, Rom. viii. 15, 1 Cor. ii. 12, Gal. iii. 2; it expresses the co-operation of the will in a degree which **δέχεσθαι**, the verb used in the next clause of "accepting" the Gospel, does not; see Acts vii. 38, xvii. 11, 1 Thess. i. 6, etc.), *or a different Gospel which ye did not accept, sc.*, when the Gospel was first brought to you by me, *ye bear with him finely!* **καλῶς** is ironical, as at Mark vii. 9 = *praeclare*. This facile acceptance of novelty is the cause of his anxiety; *cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 11, Gal. i. 6-8. Such instability is always a danger in the case of newly-founded Churches.

Vv. 5-15. He is not inferior to his Adversaries although (*a*) he is not a trained Orator (ver. 6), and although (*b*) he did not claim maintenance from the Church (ver. 7). This was not through want of affection for them, but that there might be no room for cavil.—Ver. 5. **λογίζομαι γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**: *for I reckon that I am not a whit behind these superfine Apostles;* you receive *them* gladly; why not *me?* He then proceeds to refute the two reasons which were assigned for the disparagement of his apostolic authority, *viz.*, (*a*) he had none of the arts of a trained rhetorician, (*b*) he had not claimed maintenance from the Church of Corinth, which he had a right to do, if of genuine "apostolic" rank. **οἱ ὑπερλίαν ἀπόστολοι**, "these superfine Apostles" is thus, as at xii. 11, an ironical description of the **ψευδαπόστολοι** (ver. 13) against whom he is contending. The A.V. and R.V. render "the very chiefest Apostles," *i.e.*, the original Twelve, who received their commission directly from Christ, and especially Peter, James and John; but to introduce any mention of *them* here would be irrelevant, and would interrupt the argument (they *were* **ἰδιῶται ἐν λόγῳ**), not to speak of the fact that **ὑπερλίαν** seems always in Greek literature to be used in an ironical sense.

Ver. 6. **εἰ δὲ καὶ ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ κ.τ.λ.**: *but even if I be rude in speech* (see on x. 10; **ἰδιώτης** is a "layman," who is without professional training), *yet am I not in knowledge, sc.*, of divine things (see on viii. 7 for **λόγος** and **γνῶσις**); *but in everything we have made it, sc.*, **τὴν γνῶσιν**, *manifest* (reading **φανερώσαντες**; *cf.* Col. iv. 4) *among all men* (*cf.* 1 Cor. viii. 7, Heb. xiii. 4, or "in all circumstances," as at Phil. iv. 12) *to you-ward.* He claims that he both knows the truth, and has presented it to them openly and plainly (*cf.* chap. ii. 17, iv. 2).

Ver. 7. **ἢ ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησα κ.τ.λ.**: *or did I commit a sin* (note the irony) *in abasing myself* (*cf.* Phil. iv. 12), *that ye might be exalted, sc.*, in spiritual privileges (*cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 11), *because I*

s Reff. iv. 8.
t Reff. ii. 14.
u Rom. iii. 24; Gal. ii. 21; 2 Thess. iii. 8.
v Rom. i. 1, xv. 16; 1 Thess. ii. 2, 9; 1 Pet. iv. 17.
w Here only.
x Luke iii. 14; Rom. vi. 23; 1 Cor. ix. 7 only; 1 Macc. iii. 28.
y Reff. ver. 5.
z Chap. xii. 14 only.
a Reff. ix. 12; *cf.* i. Cor. xvi. 17.
b Reff. iv. 8.
c Here only.
d Reff. i. 12.
e Rom. xv. 23; Gal. i. 21.
f Chap. xii. 2, 3.
g Rom. xi. 22.
h Reff. v. 12.

τῇ γνώσει· ἀλλ' [s]ἐν [s]παντὶ [t]φανερωθέντες [1]ἐν[2] πᾶσιν εἰς ὑμᾶς. 7. ἢ[3] ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησα, ἐμαυτὸν[4] ταπεινῶν ἵνα ὑμεῖς ὑψωθῆτε, ὅτι [u]δωρεὰν τὸ τοῦ [v]Θεοῦ [v]εὐαγγέλιον εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν; 8. ἄλλας ἐκκλησίας [w]ἐσύλησα, λαβὼν [x]ὀψώνιον πρὸς τὴν ὑμῶν διακονίαν· καὶ παρὼν πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ [y]ὑστερηθείς, οὐ [z]κατενάρκησα οὐδενός[5]· 9. τὸ γὰρ [a]ὑστέρημά μου [a]προσανεπλήρωσαν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ἐλθόντες ἀπὸ Μακεδονίας· καὶ [b]ἐν [b]παντὶ [c]ἀβαρῆ ὑμῖν[6] ἐμαυτὸν ἐτήρησα καὶ τηρήσω. 10. ἔστιν ἀλήθεια Χριστοῦ ἐν ἐμοί, ὅτι ἡ [d]καύχησις αὕτη οὐ σφραγίσεται[7] εἰς ἐμὲ ἐν τοῖς [e]κλίμασι τῆς [e]Ἀχαΐας. 11. διατί; ὅτι[8] οὐκ ἀγαπῶ ὑμᾶς; ὁ [f]Θεὸς [f]οἶδεν· 12. ὃ δὲ ποιῶ, καὶ ποιήσω, ἵνα [g]ἐκκόψω τὴν [h]ἀφορμὴν τῶν θελόντων ἀφορμήν, ἵνα ἐν ᾧ καυχῶνται

[1] ℵcDcEKLP, the Syriac and Bohairic support **φανερωθεντες**; D*, d, e, f give **φανερωθεις**; better **φανερωσαντες** with ℵ*BG 17, g.

[2] G, f, g, r, vg. and Peshitto omit **εν πασιν.**

[3] G, f, g, r, vg. give **η μη αμ.**

[4] DEGLP have **εαυτον** for **εμαυτον.**

[5] DEGKL support **ουδενος**; better **ουθενος** with ℵBMP 17, 37.

[6] ℵcDEGL, g support **υμιν εμαυτον**; better **εμαυτον υμιν** with ℵ*BMP 17, d, e, f, vg.; K om. **υμιν.**

[7] **σφραγισεται** is a scribe's blunder (supported by a few cursives only) for **φραγησεται.**

[8] B om. **οτι** after **διατι.**

preached to you the Gospel of God for nought?

Ver. 8. **ἄλλας ἐκκλησίας ἐσύλησα κ.τ.λ.**: *I robbed other Churches, e.g.*, Philippi (Phil. iv. 15. He expresses himself hyperbolically to bring out his meaning; **συλᾶν** is a very strong word, see Acts xix. 37, Rom. ii. 22), *taking wages of them* (**ὀψώνιον** primarily means the rations supplied to a soldier, and thence his *pay*; see reff.), *that I might minister unto you.* **διακονία** is not used here in special reference to the collection for the Judæan Christians, as it was at viii. 4, ix. 1, 13, but in its most general sense; *cf.* 2 Tim. iv. 11, Heb. i. 14.—**καὶ παρὼν κ.τ.λ.**: *and when I was present with you, i.e.*, during his first visit to Corinth (see Acts xviii. 1 ff.), *and was in want* (a condition which he recalls again, Phil. iv. 12), *I was not a burden on any man.* **νάρκη** is the torpedo-fish, which paralyses its victims by contact, and then preys upon them; so **καταναρκᾶν** signifies "to oppress heavily". The compound verb is not found elsewhere in Greek literature (we have **ναρκᾶν** in Gen. xxxii. 25, Job xxxiii. 19); Jerome says (Ep. cxxi. *ad Algasiam*) that it is a Cilicianism, like **ἡμέρα** in 1 Cor. iv. 3.

Ver. 9. **τὸ γὰρ ὑστέρημά μου κ.τ.λ.**: *for the brethren, when they came from Macedonia* (very likely Silas and Timothy; see Acts xviii. 5, Phil. iv. 15), *supplied the measure of my want; and in everything I kept myself* (note the aorists as pointing to the definite period of his residence in Corinth) *from being burdensome unto you* (*cf.* xii. 16, 1 Thess. ii. 6), *and so will I keep myself.*

Ver. 10. **ἔστιν ἀλήθ. Χρ. κ.τ.λ.**: *as the Truth of Christ* (we have **ἡ ἀλήθ. τ. Θεοῦ**, Rom. i. 25, iii. 7, xv. 8; *cf.* John xiv. 6, Eph. iv. 21) *is in me* (for the form of the asseveration see on i. 18; Rom. ix. 1 is not a true parallel to the constr. here), *this glorying, sc.*, in my independence, *shall not be stopped, as far as I am concerned, in the regions of Achaia* (see on i. 1); *cf.* vii. 14. The true reading is **φραγήσεται**; **φράσσειν** is "to fence," but in N.T. (Rom. iii. 19, Heb. xi. 33; *cf.* also Dan. vi. 22) is used with **στόμα** in the sense of "to stop" the mouth.

Ver. 11. **διατί; ὅτι οὐκ ἀγ. κ.τ.λ.**: *wherefore? because I love you not? God knoweth, i.e.*, that I *do* love you.

Ver. 12. **ὃ δὲ ποιῶ κ.τ.λ.**: *but what I do, that I will do that*, by refusing to accept maintenance gratis at your hands,

εὑρεθῶσι καθὼς καὶ ἡμεῖς. 13. οἱ [1] γὰρ [i] τοιοῦτοι [k] ψευδαπόστολοι, [k] ἐργάται [k] δόλιοι, [l] μετασχηματιζόμενοι εἰς ἀποστόλους Χριστοῦ· 14. καὶ οὐ θαυμαστόν [2]· αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ [m] Σατανᾶς μετασχηματίζεται εἰς [3] ἄγγελον φωτός· 15. οὐ μέγα οὖν [4] εἰ καὶ οἱ διάκονοι αὐτοῦ μεταμ σχηματίζονται ὡς διάκονοι δικαιοσύνης, ὧν τὸ τέλος ἔσται [5] κατὰ τὰ

i Reff. ii. 6. k Here only. l 1 Cor. iv. 6; Phil. iii. 21; 4 Macc. ix. 22. m Reff. ii. 11.

[1] G has **ου γαρ** for **οι γαρ** and omits **εις** before **αποστ.**

[2] D^{bc}EKLM support **θαυμαστον**; better **θαυμα** (Rev. xvii. 6 only) with ℵBD*GPR 17.

[3] D*, d, e, m give **ως αγγελος** for **εις αγγ.**

[4] D*, d, e, m and the Peshitto omit **ουν.** [5] D*, d, e, m have **εστιν** for **εσται.**

I may cut off the occasion (**τὴν ἀφορμ.**, the definite opportunity for attack which my opponents desire) *from those who desire occasion that in the matter of their boast, sc.*, that as of Apostolic rank free maintenance was their rightful due, *they may be found even as we, i.e.*, they desire that I and they may be on equal terms so far as the taking of money is concerned. It is better to regard the second **ἵνα**, not as in apposition with the first, but as dependent on **θελ. ἀφορμ.** and as expressing the desire of St. Paul's *opponents*, not his own. The situation seems to have been as follows: St. Paul held that the "labourer is worthy of his hire" (Luke x. 7, 1 Tim. v. 18), and in 1 Cor. ix. 11-13 he gives a clear exposition of the principle as applied to preachers of the Gospel. On these grounds he more than once (Phil. iv. 15, 16) accepted money from the generous Church of Philippi. But it was not his usual practice. He reminds the Thessalonians (1 Thess. ii. 9) that when with them he had worked for his living. So too he did at Corinth (Acts xviii. 2), any help he then accepted coming from Macedonia (chap. xi. 9); and he did the same at Ephesus (Acts xx. 34). Now his Corinthian opponents were very ready to take money for their teaching (1 Cor. ix. 12); indeed they prided themselves on doing so, as it was the privilege of "apostles". This determined St. Paul that it should never be truly said of him that he was a hireling teacher, and so he was especially careful at Corinth (1 Cor. ix. 15-19) to avoid even the appearance of grasping after money (*cf.* Gen. xiv. 23). This honourable independence, however, created a difficulty in two directions. On the one hand, it gave his opponents a handle for saying that he was not really of Apostolic rank, inasmuch as he dared not claim Apostolic privilege; and, on the other hand, it hurt the feelings of his Corinthian friends that he should refuse maintenance at their hands. His reply is contained in vv. 7-12 of this chapter. And the point of ver. 12 is that his action is necessary, for if he were to take money as his opponents did, it would speedily be made a matter of cavil, and would tend to bring him down to their level (see also xii. 14).

Ver. 13. **οἱ γὰρ τοιοῦτοι κ.τ.λ.**: *for such men* (this explains the ground of his determination in ver. 12 not to give opportunity for cavil) *are false apostles* (*cf.* Rev. ii. 2. This speedy appearance of false teachers was one of the most remarkable features of the Apostolic age; *cf.* Gal. ii. 4, Phil. i. 15, iii. 18, Tit. i. 10, 2 Pet. ii. 1, 1 John iv. 1), *crafty workers* (*cf.* Phil. iii. 2), *fashioning themselves into Apostles of Christ, i.e.*, laying special claim to that great title (*cf.* chap. x. 7). **μετασχηματίζειν τι** is to change the outward appearance (**σχῆμα**) of a thing, the thing itself in essence (**μορφή**) remaining unchanged (see reff.).

Ver. 14. **καὶ οὐ θαῦμα κ.τ.λ.**: *and no marvel; for even Satan fashioneth himself into an angel of light.* Light is the symbol of God (1 John i. 5, 1 Tim. vi. 16) and His messengers (Matt. xxviii. 3, Acts xii. 7), as darkness is the symbol of Satan (Luke xxii. 53, Eph. vi. 12, Col. i. 13). The **μετασχηματισμός** of Satan has just before been in the Apostle's mind (ver. 3), and perhaps such passages as Gen. iii. 1, Job i. 6, 1 Kings xxii. 19-23 sufficiently account for the image. But it is more probable that some Rabbinical tradition lies behind the word used by St. Paul; *cf. Apoc. Moysis* (v. 17) **τότε ὁ σατανᾶς ἐγένετο ἐν εἴδει ἀγγέλου.** A reference has been here found by Ewald to Matt. iv. 1-11, but while it is not improbable that the Apostle had heard the story of the Lord's Temptation, there is no clear trace of it in his Epistles.

Ver. 15. **οὐ μέγα οὖν κ.τ.λ.**: *it is no great thing therefore, if his ministers also,*

ἔργα αὐτῶν. 16. Πάλιν λέγω, Μή τίς με δόξῃ [n] ἄφρονα εἶναι· εἰ
δὲ μή [1] γε, κἂν ὡς ἄφρονα δέξασθέ με, ἵνα μικρόν [2] τι κἀγὼ καυχή-
σωμαι.[3] 17. ὃ λαλῶ, οὐ[4] λαλῶ κατὰ Κύριον, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐν [o] ἀφροσύνῃ,
ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ [p] ὑποστάσει τῆς καυχήσεως· 18. ἐπεὶ πολλοὶ καυχῶνται
κατὰ τὴν [5] [q] σάρκα, κἀγὼ καυχήσομαι. 19. ἡδέως γὰρ ἀνέχεσθε
τῶν ἀφρόνων, [r] φρόνιμοι ὄντες· 20. ἀνέχεσθε [6] γὰρ, εἴ τις ὑμᾶς
[s] καταδουλοῖ, εἴ τις [t] κατεσθίει, εἴ τις λαμβάνει, εἴ τις [u] ἐπαίρεται,

n Rom. ii. 20; 1 Cor. xv. 36; ver. 19, chap. xii. 6, 11; Eph. v. 17.
o Reff. ver. 1.
p Reff. ix. 4. q Reff. i. 17.
r Rom. xi. 25, xii. 16 (Prov. iii. 7); 1 Cor. iv. 10, x. 15.
s Gal. ii. 4 only.
t Mark xii. 40; Gal. v. 15.
u Reff. x. 5.

[1] D* has μη for μηγε.

[2] καγω μικρον τι is the order in all the best authorities; μικρον τι καγω only in a few cursives and the Harclean.

[3] DEKLPR give καυχησομαι; καυχησωμαι, ℵBGM.

[4] The order ου λαλω κατα Κυρ. is found in DELM, d, e, r, vg., the Bohairic and Harclean; better ου κατα Κυρ. λαλω with ℵBGKPR, f, g and the Peshitto. For κατα Κυριον f, r give κατα Θεον.

[5] ℵ*D*GR 17, 73 give κατα σαρκα; ins. την ℵcBDcEKLMP.

[6] The Armenian vs. adds after ανεχ. γαρ, ει τις εξαπατᾳ υμας.

sc., as well as himself, *fashion themselves as ministers of righteousness* (see on iii. 9); *whose end*, notwithstanding their disguise (*cf.* Rom. vi. 21, Phil. iii. 19), *shall be according to their works* (see on ver. 10).

Vv. 16-33. His Apostolic labours and trials.—Ver. 16. **πάλιν λέγω κ.τ.λ.**: *I say again* (the first time having been in ver. 1), *let no man think me foolish, i.e.*, senseless with the **ἀφροσύνη** of self-praise; *but even if ye do* (for **εἰ δὲ μή γε** *cf.* Matt. vi. 1, ix. 17, Luke xiii. 9, xiv. 32), *yet receive me as foolish* (there is a somewhat similar ellipse in Mark vi. 56, Acts v. 15), *that I also, sc.*, as well as they (*cf.* ver. 18), *may glory a little* (**μικρόν τι** = "a trifle," "a little bit").

Ver. 17. **ὃ λαλῶ κ.τ.λ.**: *what I speak, I speak not after the Lord, i.e.*, Christ (he refuses to claim Divine inspiration for his self-glorying; *cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 12, 25), *but as in foolishness, in this confidence of glorying* (see on ix. 4 for **ὑπόστασις**).

Ver. 18. **ἐπεὶ πολλοὶ καυχῶνται κ.τ.λ.**: *seeing that many, sc.*, of the Corinthian Judaisers against whom this whole polemic is directed (*cf.* ii. 17, where they are also alluded to as **οἱ πολλοί**), *glory after the flesh, i.e.*, in external circumstances which are really no fit subject for glorying (see, on **ἐν προσώπῳ**, chap. v. 12 and reff.), *I too will glory, sc.*, after the flesh; *i.e.*, he proceeds to explain how much better external grounds he has for boasting than his Judaising rivals.

Ver. 19. **ἡδέως γὰρ ἀνέχεσθε κ.τ.λ.**: *for ye bear with the foolish, i.e.*, the false teachers, *gladly, being wise yourselves*, the latter clause being, of course, ironical, although (see reff.) it was true that **φρόνησις** was a quality which he had seriously ascribed to the Corinthians in a former letter. His point is that, as they have borne with the self-commendation of the pseudo-apostles, they should extend the same indulgent toleration to him. He then goes on to remind them of the insolence and ill-treatment which they had endured at the hands of these self-constituted spiritual guides.

Ver. 20. **ἀνέχεσθε γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**: *for ye bear with a man if he* (we cannot press **τις** so as to point to any special individual; *cf.* x. 7) *enslave you* (in contrast to any such tyranny, St. Paul describes himself as the **δοῦλος** of the Corinthians; see iv. 5, and *cf.* Acts xv. 10); *if he devour you, i.e.*, robs you of your substance by greedily demanding maintenance, as these "superfine Apostles" did (see on ver. 12, and *cf.* Rom. xvi. 18, Phil. iii. 19); *if he take you captive* (**λαμβάνειν** is thus used of catching fish, Luke v. 5; *cf.* chap. xii. 16. Field defends the A.V. "taketh of you," *i.e.*, takes money, by appealing to the Peshitto, and also by the usage of good Greek writers); *if he exalt himself* (*cf.* x. 12, xi. 18); *if he smite you on the face.* A blow in the face was, and is, a common form of insult in the East (*cf.* 1 Kings xxii. 24, Matt. v. 39, xxvi. 67,

εἴ τις ὑμᾶς[1] εἰς πρόσωπον [v]δέρει. 21. κατὰ [w]ἀτιμίαν λέγω, [x]ὡς [x]ὅτι ἡμεῖς[2] [y]ἠσθενήσαμεν[3]· ἐν ᾧ δ'[4] ἄν τις [z]τολμᾷ, (ἐν[5] [a]ἀφροσύνῃ λέγω,) τολμῶ κἀγώ. 22. [b]Ἑβραῖοί εἰσι; κἀγώ· Ἰσραηλῖταί εἰσι; κἀγώ· σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ εἰσι; κἀγώ· 23. διάκονοι Χριστοῦ εἰσι, (ᶜπαραφρονῶν λαλῶ,[6]) ᶜὑπὲρ ᶜἐγώ· ἐν [d]κόποις περισσοτέρως, ἐν[7] [d]πληγαῖς ᶜὑπερβαλλόντως, ἐν [d]φυλακαῖς περισσοτέρως, ἐν θανάτοις

v 1 Cor. ix. 26.
w Chap. vi. 8, etc.
x Reff. v. 19.
y Ver. 29, chaps. xii. 10, xiii. 3, 9, etc.
z Reff. x. 2.
a Reff. ver. 1.
b Acts vi. 1; Phil. iii. 5 only.
c Here only.
d Reff. vi. 5.

[1] **υμας εις προσ.** is the order of DᵇKLM and the Peshitto; better **εις προσ. υμας** with ℵBD*EGP 17, the Latins and Harclean.

[2] G, g place **ημεις** after **ησθεν.**

[3] **ησθενησαμεν** is supported by DEGKLMP; better **ησθενηκαμεν** with ℵB 17, 37, 73. After **ησθεν.** DE, d, e and the Clem. vg. add **εν τουτῳ τῳ μερει.**

[4] D*, d, e, vg. and the Syriac have **αν** for **δ' αν.**

[5] G, g have **εν αφρ. λεγω** after **τολμω καγω.**

[6] DEG, the Latin and Peshitto give **λεγω** for **λαλω.**

[7] BD*E 17, d, e, f, vg. (followed by W.H. and the R.V.) give the order **εν φυλ. περισσ., εν πληγ. υπερβ.,** which we adopt; the rec. text is supported by ℵᶜDᵇKLM, the Syriac and Bohairic vss.; ℵG, g (followed by Tisch.) give **εν πληγ. περισσ., εν φυλ. υπερβ.**; P has **εν φυλ. υπερβ., εν πληγ. περισσ.**

Acts xxiii. 2, 1 Cor. iv. 11); and the despotic teachers whom the Corinthians tolerated had very likely inflicted this last indignity upon them. *Cf.* 1 Tim. iii. 3, Tit. i. 7, where it is forbidden to the **ἐπίσκοποι** to be "strikers". "Such are your teachers," he says to them, "*I* am but weak in comparison with these strenuous spiritual directors."

Ver. 21. **κατὰ ἀτιμίαν λέγω κ.τ.λ.**: *by way of disparagement, sc.*, humbly of myself, *I say that we, i.e.*, I myself, **ἡμεῖς** being ironically emphasised, *have been weak, i.e.*, I have not attempted to enforce my authority in any of these directions (*cf.* x. 10 and 1 Cor. ii. 3). He now changes his tone from irony to direct and masterful assertion, and in the splendid passage which follows he makes the "boast" which he has been leading up to with such prolonged explanations.—**ἐν ᾧ δ' ἄν κ.τ.λ.**: *and yet whereinsoever any man is bold* (*I speak in foolishness*—this he is careful to add once more; see ver. 17), *I am bold* also. His whole life will justify him.

Ver. 22. **Ἑβραῖοί εἰσι; κἀγώ**: *are they Hebrews? so am I.* At a later period the term **Ἑβραῖος** was not confined to Palestinian Jews (Eus., *H.E.*, ii., 4, 2, iii. 4, 2), but expressed mere nationality. However in the N.T. it is used in contrast with **Ἑλληνιστής** (Acts vi. 1; *cf.* Phil. iii. 5), and denotes a Jew who retained his national language and customs. Jerome states (*de Vir. ill.*) that St. Paul was born in Gischala of Galilee, but this cannot be true in the face of his own statement that he was born in Tarsus (Acts xxii. 3).—**Ἰσραηλεῖταί εἰσιν; κἀγώ**: *are they Israelites? so am I.* The term Israelite expresses the sacred character of the nation, like the term *Quirites* for Romans, and is always used in the N.T. as a term of praise (John i. 48, etc.).—**σπέρμα Ἀβρ. κ.τ.λ.**: *are they the seed of Abraham? so am I.* This is the highest dignity of all, to be an inheritor of the Messianic promises given to Abraham (*cf.* for the phrase Isa. xli. 8, John viii. 33, Rom. ix. 7, Gal. iii. 29). In the two parallel passages, Rom. xi. 1, Phil. iii. 5, he adds that he is of the tribe of Benjamin—a fact which probably accounts for his name "Saul" (1 Sam. ix. 1). It shows how strong the Judaising party were at Corinth that he thinks it important to put this proud statement of his descent in the forefront of his apology.

Ver. 23. **διάκονοι Χρ. κ.τ.λ.**: *are they Christ's ministers?* (as they specially claimed to be; *cf.* x. 7)—*I speak as one beside himself* (*sc.*, as if he would say "this is mad boasting indeed; for what office *can* be higher than this?"); *I am more, i.e.*, I am that in a higher degree than they (**ὑπέρ** being used adverbially), as is proved by my trials in the service of the Gospel. The summary which follows is of deep interest for the student of St.

πολλάκις. 24. ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων [e] πεντάκις τεσσαράκοντα[1] [e] παρὰ [e] μίαν
ἔλαβον, 25. τρὶς ἐρραβδίσθην,[2] ἅπαξ ἐλιθάσθην, τρὶς [f] ἐναυάγησα,
[g] νυχθήμερον ἐν τῷ [h] βυθῷ πεποίηκα· 26. [i] ὁδοιπορίαις πολλάκις[3]·
[k] κινδύνοις ποταμῶν, κινδύνοις λῃστῶν, κινδύνοις ἐκ [l] γένους, κινδύ-
νοις ἐξ ἐθνῶν, κινδύνοις ἐν πόλει, κινδύνοις ἐν [m] ἐρημίᾳ, κινδύνοις ἐν

e Here only. f 1 Tim. i. 19 only. g Here only. h Here only; Pss. lxviii. 16, cvi. 24. i John iv. 6 only. k Rom. viii. 35 only. l 2 Macc. xii. 31. m Mark viii. 4; Heb. xi. 38.

[1] The preferable spelling is τεσσερακοντα with ℵB*DE.

[2] The preferable spelling is εραβδισθην with all the uncials except M.

[3] D*, d, e and the Peshitto give πολλαις for πολλακις.

Paul's life; he goes into more definite detail than elsewhere (*cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 11-13, chap. iv. 7-10, vi. 4-10), and gives us a more vivid picture of his extraordinary labours than would be possible to form from the narrative in the *Acts* alone. It will be remembered that his missionary career lasted for ten or eleven years after this Epistle was written, and that therefore we cannot regard these verses as giving us a *complete* list of his trials.—**ἐν κόποις κ.τ.λ.**: *in labours more abundantly*, *sc.*, than they (*cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 10), *in prisons more abundantly* (up to this point in his life we only know of one imprisonment, *viz.*, at Philippi, Acts xvi. 23, but there must have been others; *cf.* Rom. xvi. 7, where he speaks of Andronicus and Junias as having been his "fellow-prisoners" on some occasion to which no other allusion had been preserved. Afterwards we read of his being imprisoned at Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 33), at Cæsarea (Acts xxiii. 35) and at Rome (Acts xxviii. 30), besides which the evidence of the Pastoral Epistles gives another Roman imprisonment. Clement of Rome (§ 5) speaks of St. Paul as *seven* times in bonds; *cf.* vi. 5 above), *in stripes above measure*, details of which are given in the following verses (*cf.* Acts xxi. 32), *in deaths oft*, *i.e.*, in frequent perils of death (*cf.* Acts ix. 23, xiv. 19, etc., and chaps. i. 10, vi. 9).

Ver. 24. **ὑπὸ Ἰουδ. κ.τ.λ.**: *of the Jews five times received I forty* stripes (there is an ellipse of **πληγάς** as at Luke xii. 47) *save one*. The Law forbad more than forty stripes (Deut. xxv. 3); and, to be on the safe side, it was the custom in the judicial scourgings of the synagogues (Matt. xxiii. 34, Acts xxii. 19) to stop short at thirty-nine. This punishment was so severe that death often ensued (cf. Josephus, *Antt.*, iv., 8, 21); we know nothing of the circumstances under which it was inflicted on St. Paul.

Ver. 25. **τρὶς ἐραβδίσθην κ.τ.λ.**: *thrice was I beaten with rods*, *i.e.*, "virgis caesus sum," a *Roman*, as distinct from the *Jewish*, method of scourging—distinct too from flagellation with *thongs* (Matt. xxvii. 26). It was forbidden in the case of a Roman citizen by the Lex Porcia, but nevertheless St. Paul had endured it at Philippi (Acts xvi. 23, 37), and barely escaped it at Jerusalem (Acts xxii. 25). We do not know the other two occasions alluded to.—**ἅπαξ ἐλιθάσθην κ.τ.λ.**: *once was I stoned*, *i.e.*, at Lystra (Acts xiv. 19, and *almost* at Iconium, ver. 5), *thrice I suffered shipwreck*, of the circumstances of which we have no record, for the shipwreck on his voyage to Rome (Acts xxvii.) was subsequent to this, *a night and a day have I been* (there seems to be no special reason here for the perf. in preference to the aorist) *in the deep*, probably after one of the shipwrecks (*cf.* Acts xxvii. 44). For **ποιεῖν** with words of time *cf.* Acts xv. 33, xx. 3, Jas. iv. 13.

Ver. 26. **ὁδοιπορίαις πολλ. κ.τ.λ.**: *in journeyings often* (of the extent of which the *Acts* gives us some idea; their dangers are now enumerated), *in perils of rivers*, *sc.*, from swollen torrents dangerous to ford (Stanley notes that Frederick Barbarossa was drowned in the Calycadnus, not far from Tarsus; see Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 23, for several illustrations of the dangers of the Pisidian highlands), *in perils of robbers*, on account of whom travelling in Asia Minor was, and still is, dangerous (the district of Perga and Pamphylia which St. Paul traversed on his first missionary journey was notorious for brigands; see Strabo, xii., 6, 7), *in perils from my kindred*, *i.e.*, persecutions at the hands of the Jews which he had suffered (see Acts ix. 23, 29, xiii. 50, xiv. 5, 19, xvii. 5, 13, xviii. 12, 1 Thess. ii. 15), and from which he was yet to suffer more (Acts

θαλάσσῃ, κινδύνοις ἐν [n]ψευδαδέλφοις· 27. ἐν[1] [o]κόπῳ καὶ [o]μόχθῳ, ἐν [p]ἀγρυπνίαις πολλάκις,[2] ἐν [q]λιμῷ καὶ [r]δίψει,[3] ἐν [p]νηστείαις πολλάκις,[2] ἐν [s]ψύχει καὶ [q]γυμνότητι· 28. χωρὶς τῶν [t]παρεκτὸς, ἡ ἐπισύστασίς[4] μου[5] ἡ καθ' ἡμέραν, ἡ [u]μέριμνα πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν. 29. τίς [v]ἀσθενεῖ, καὶ οὐκ ἀσθενῶ; τίς [w]σκανδαλίζεται, καὶ οὐκ ἐγὼ

n Gal. ii. 4 only. o 1 Thess. ii. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 8. p Reff. vi. 5. q Rom. viii. 35. r Here only.

s Acts xxviii. 2. t Matt. v. 32; Acts xxvi. 29 only. u Mark iv. 19; Luke xxi. 34; 1 Pet. v. 7.
v Reff. ver. 21. w Rom. xiv. 21; 1 Cor. viii. 13.

[1] ℵ[c]KLMP, f, vg., etc., support **εν κοπῳ**; better om. **εν** with ℵ*BDEG, d, e, g.

[2] D*, d, e, f, vg. and the Peshitto have **πολλαις** (twice) for **πολλακις.**

[3] B has **διψη.**

[4] KLMP support **επισυστασις**; better **επιστασις** with ℵBDEG 17 (*cf.* Acts xxiv. 12) and vg. = *instantia.*

[5] ℵ[c]DEKLMP, f, g, vg. support **μου**; better **μοι** with ℵ*BG 17.

xx. 3, xxi. 31, xxiii. 12, xxv. 3), *in perils from the Gentiles*, as, *e.g.*, at Iconium (Acts xiv. 5), at Philippi (Acts xvi. 20) and at Ephesus (Acts xix. 23), *in perils in the city* (Acts xxi. 31 and *passim*), *in the desert* (Arabia (?), Gal. i. 17), *in the sea, i.e.*, in town and country, by land and by water, *in perils among false brethren, i.e.*, probably the Judaisers who were his bitter opponents (*cf.* ver. 13 and Gal. ii. 4).

Ver. 27. **κόπῳ καὶ μόχ. κ.τ.λ.**: *in labour and travail, in watchings often* (see on vi. 5), *in hunger and thirst* (*cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 11, Phil. iv. 12), *in fastings often, i.e.*, plainly, in involuntary deprivation of all food (the idea of voluntary devotional fastings is quite foreign to the context here, and to bring it in spoils the rhetorical force of the passage; see on vi. 5), *in cold and nakedness* (*cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 11).

Ver. 28. **χωρὶς τῶν παρ. κ.τ.λ.**: *besides the things which I omit* (see reff., and *cf.* Heb. xi. 32; the A.V. "those things that are without" = vulg. *quae sunt extrinsecus*, is wrong), *there is that which presseth upon me daily, anxiety for all the churches* (see on viii. 18). **ἐπισύστασις** of the rec. text means a combination for hostile purposes, and is used of Korah's rebellion in Num. xvi. 40, xxvi. 9, in which latter place we have the same textual variants as here (*cf.* also 1 Esdr. v. 73). This *may* be the true reading, both here and at Acts xxiv. 12, for the syllable **συ** might readily drop out in transcription. If it be adopted here it would refer to the cabals of the Apostle's adversaries = "the daily combination against me," and would thus indicate a trial distinct from "the care of all the churches," which is next mentioned. But, although this gives a good sense, we prefer to read **ἐπίστασις** as better supported both here and at Acts xxiv. 12 (the only places of its occurrence in N.T.). Polybius uses the word as = "attention," "close observation," but this will not suit Acts xxiv. 12. It is found in 2 Macc. vi. 3 as = "visitation" or "pressure," and the latter rendering seems best to satisfy the context here. We have therefore followed the Revisers in adopting the Vulgate rendering *instantia* = "that which presseth," and in taking **ἡ μέριμνα κ.τ.λ.** as in apposition with **ἡ ἐπίστασις.**

Ver. 29. **τίς ἀσθενεῖ κ.τ.λ.**: *who is weak, sc.*, in prejudice (as at Rom. xiv. 1, 1 Cor. viii. 11), *and I am not weak, i.e.*, in Christian sympathy (*cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 22 **ἐγενόμην τοῖς ἀσθενέσιν ἀσθενής**); *who is made to stumble, and I burn not? i.e.*, with the fire of righteous indignation (*cf.* **πυρωθείς** = "inflamed" at 2 Macc. iv. 38). The word **ἀσθενῶ** now suggests to him a new thought, that it is in his weakness as supported by God's grace rather than in any strength of his own that his real boast may be made.

Ver. 30. **εἰ καυχᾶσθαι κ.τ.λ.**: *if I must needs glory, I will glory of the things that concern my weakness* (*cf.* chap. xii. 5, 9), such as are the perils and indignities which he has recounted in the preceding verses.

Ver. 31. **ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ κ.τ.λ.**: *the God and Father of the Lord Jesus, who is blessed for evermore* (see on i. 3, and for **ὁ ὤν** as applied to God, "the self-existent one," *cf.* Exod. iii. 14, Wisd. xiii. 1, Rev. i. 8), *knoweth that I lie not* (*cf.* xii. 6). This solemn asseveration belongs (see reff.) to what *follows*, and not to the statements which precede

x 1 Cor. vii. 9; Eph. vi. 16.
y 1 Cor. ii. 3; chaps. xii. 5, 9, 10, xiii. 4.
z Reff. i. 3.
a Rom. i. 25, ix. 5; Ps. lxxxviii. 53.
b Rom. ix. 1; Gal. i. 20; 1 Tim. ii. 7.
c Gal. iii. 23; Phil. iv. 7.
d Acts xx. 9 only.
e Here only.
f Acts ix. 25, xxvii. 17.

[x] πυροῦμαι; 30. εἰ καυχᾶσθαι δεῖ, τὰ τῆς [y] ἀσθενείας μου [1] καυχήσομαι. 31. [z] Ὁ [2] [z] Θεὸς καὶ [z] πατὴρ τοῦ [z] Κυρίου ἡμῶν [3] [z] Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [4] οἶδεν, ὁ ὢν [a] εὐλογητὸς [a] εἰς τοὺς [a] αἰῶνας, ὅτι [b] οὐ [b] ψεύδομαι. 32. ἐν Δαμασκῷ ὁ ἐθνάρχης [c] Ἀρέτα τοῦ βασιλέως [c] ἐφρούρει τὴν Δαμασκηνῶν [5] πόλιν, πιάσαι με θέλων [6]· 33. καὶ διὰ [d] θυρίδος ἐν [e] σαργάνῃ [f] ἐχαλάσθην διὰ τοῦ τείχους, καὶ ἐξέφυγον τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ.

[1] B om. μου. [2] D*E, d, e have ο Θεος του Ισραηλ.

[3] ℵBGKL, g and the Harclean omit ημων; ins. DEMP, d, e, f, vg. the Peshitto and Bohairic.

[4] DEKLMP, d, e, f, vg. the Peshitto and Bohairic support Χριστου; om. ℵBG 17, 37, g and the Harclean.

[5] DbKLM support Δαμ. πολιν; the preferable order is πολιν Δαμ. with ℵBD*EGP 17, 37 and the Latins.

[6] BD*, d, e, f, vg. and the Peshitto omit θελων; ins. ℵDcEKLMP and (before πιασαι με) G, g, the Bohairic and Harclean.

it. If the text is not corrupt, it would seem that the Apostle intended now to illustrate in detail the providence which overruled his life, the "strength which was perfected in weakness," and that, beginning with one of the earliest and least dignified perils of his career as a Christian missionary, he then is led off through some train of ideas which we cannot trace into the quite different subject of his "visions" and "revelations," which diverts him from his original intention. If, on the other hand, we might suppose vv. 32, 33 to be a marginal gloss (founded on Acts ix. 23-25, and perhaps introduced in reference to the **κίνδυνοι ἐκ γένους** of ver. 26) which was not part of the original text—though possibly an autograph addition made after the letter was finished—the argument would be quite consecutive. He feels the remarkable account in xii. 2-4 to be so incredible that he thinks it right to prefix the strong asseveration of ver. 31 that he is telling the truth. But there is no MS. authority for thus treating vv. 32, 33.

Ver. 32. **ἐν Δαμασκῷ ὁ ἐθν. κ.τ.λ.**: *in Damascus the ethnarch under Aretas the king guarded the city of the Damascenes, sc.*, by placing a watch at the gates, *to take me; and through a window* (*i.e.*, an aperture in the city wall, or the window of a house overhanging the wall) *was I let down in a basket* (**σαργάνη** is anything twisted, and so here probably a rope basket; **σφυρίς** is the word used in Acts ix. 25) *by the wall, and escaped his hands.* The incident took place on St. Paul's return to Damascus from Arabia (Gal. i. 17) and is narrated in Acts ix. 23-25. The date of it is important in the chronology of the Apostle's life. It could not have been before A.D. 34, for coins of Tiberius prove Damascus to have been under direct Roman administration in that year. Tiberius was unlikely to have handed Damascus over to Aretas (fourth of the name), the hereditary chief (*cf.* 2 Macc. v. 8) of the Nabathæan Arabs; for up to the close of the reign of Tiberius military operations were being carried on against Aretas by the legate of Syria. Hence Damascus was probably not ceded to Aretas until the reign of Caligula, and consequently this episode in St. Paul's life cannot have taken place before the middle of A.D. 37. Instigated by the Jews (Acts ix. 23), the "ethnarch," or provincial governor of Damascus under Aretas (*cf.* 1 Macc. xiv. 47), laid a plan for the arrest of the Apostle which was frustrated by St. Paul's escape in the manner described (*cf.* Josh. ii. 15, 1 Sam. xix. 12).

CHAPTER XII.—Vv. 1-6. THE APOSTLE'S VISION: IF HE CHOSE, HE COULD BOAST OF IT.—Ver. 1. With Tisch., W.H. and the R.V. we adopt the reading (see crit. notes): **καυχᾶσθαι δεῖ· οὐ συμφέρον μέν, ἐλεύσομαι δὲ κ.τ.λ.**: *I must needs glory, though it is not expedient* (*sc.*, my opponents drive me to it); *but I will come to visions* such as were seen by Daniel (x. 1), which were predicted as to be granted in the New Dispensation (Joel ii. 28 f., quoted in Acts ii. 17), which were seen by St. Peter (Acts x. 10), and by St. John (Rev. i. 10, iv. 1), as well as by St. Paul him-

XII. 1. Καυχᾶσθαι[1] δὴ[2] οὐ συμφέρει[3] μοι· ἐλεύσομαι γὰρ[4] εἰς [a]ὀπτασίας[5] καὶ ἀποκαλύψεις Κυρίου.[6] 2. οἶδα ἄνθρωπον [b]ἐν [b]Χριστῷ πρὸ ἐτῶν δεκατεσσάρων, (εἴτε [c]ἐν [c]σώματι,[7] οὐκ οἶδα· εἴτε [d]ἐκτὸς [d]τοῦ[8] [d]σώματος, οὐκ οἶδα· ὁ [e]Θεὸς [e]οἶδεν·) [f]ἁρπαγέντα τὸν τοιοῦτον ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ. 3. καὶ οἶδα τὸν τοιοῦτον ἄνθρωπον, (εἴτε ἐν σώματι, εἴτε ἐκτὸς[9] τοῦ σώματος, οὐκ[10] οἶδα· ὁ Θεὸς οἶδεν·) 4. ὅτι ἡρπάγη εἰς τὸν [g]παράδεισον, καὶ ἤκουσεν [h]ἄρρητα ῥήματα, ἃ

a Luke i. 22, xxiv. 23; Acts xxvi. 19 only. b Reff. v. 17. c Reff. v. 6. d 1 Cor. vi. 18. e Chap. xi. 11. f Acts viii. 39; 1 Thess. iv. 17; Rev. xii. 5. g Luke xxiii. 43; Rev. ii. 7 only. h Here only.

[1] ℵc, f, vg. prefix **ει** before **καυχ.** (from xi. 30).

[2] KM support **δη**; ℵD* and the Bohairic give **δε**; BDcEGLP 17, 37, the Latin and Syriac vss. have **δει.**

[3] DcEKL and the Harclean support **συμφερει μοι**; D* and the Peshitto give **συμφερει** without **μοι**; better **συμφερον μεν** with ℵBGP 17, 67**, f, g, vg. and the Bohairic.

[4] **γαρ** is read by DEKL and the Syriac vss.; better **δε** with ℵB (which adds **και**) GP 17, 73, f, g, vg. and the Bohairic.

[5] GP have **εις τα(ς) οπτ.**

[6] G, g give **Χριστον** for **Κυριου.**

[7] D*E* have **εν τῳ σωμ.**

[8] B om. **του** before **σωματος.**

[9] ℵDbcE**GKLMP support **εκτος** (from ver. 2); BD*E* have **χωρις,** which is perhaps preferable.

[10] B om. **ουκ οιδα,** and accordingly W.H. bracket the words.

self (Acts ix. 3, *cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 1, Acts ix. 12, xxii. 17) *and revelations of the Lord, sc.*, revelations granted by Christ (Rev. i. 1). St. Paul repeatedly insists that he received his message **δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰη. Χρ.** (Gal. i. 12, Eph. iii. 3; *cf.* 1 Cor. xi. 23, xv. 3); on one occasion he went up to Jerusalem **κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν** (Gal. ii. 1); and he claims to have the power of speaking **ἐν ἀποκαλύψει** (1 Cor. xiv. 6), as had also some of his Corinthian converts (1 Cor. xiv. 26). He now mentions one signal instance of such a "vision and revelation" which was vouchsafed to him.

Ver. 2. **οἶδα ἄνθρ. ἐν Χρ. κ.τ.λ.**: *I know* (not "I knew" as the A.V. has it) *a man in Christ, i.e.*, a Christian (see reff.), *fourteen years ago* (for the constr. **πρὸ ἐτ. δεκ.** *cf.* John xii. 1)—*whether in the body, I know not; or whether out of the body, I know not* (the words distinctly indicate St. Paul's belief that perception is possible for a disembodied spirit); *God knoweth—such an one caught up to the third heaven. Cf.* Ezek. viii. 3. "The Spirit lifted me between the earth and the heaven, and brought me in the visions of God to Jerusalem." The date of this trance must have been about 41 or 42 A.D., years of which we have no details so far as St. Paul's life is concerned; probably he was then at Tarsus (Acts ix. 30, xi. 25; *cf.* the reference to St. Paul in the dialogue *Philopatris*, § 12: **ἐς τρίτον οὐρανὸν ἀεροβατήσας**). The mention of "the third heaven" raises interesting questions as to Jewish beliefs. There is no doubt that a plurality of "heavens" is recognised all through the O.T. (see, *e.g.*, Deut. x. 14, 1 Kings viii. 27, Neh. ix. 6, Ps. lxviii. 33 and cxlviii. 4); but it has been matter of dispute whether the Rabbinical schools recognised *seven* heavens or only *three*. However it is now fairly well established that, in common with other ancient peoples (*e.g.*, the Parsees, and probably the Babylonians), the Jews recognised *seven* heavens. This view not only appears in the pseud-epigraphical literature, but in some of the Fathers, *e.g.*, Clement of Alexandria. Its most detailed exposition is found in the *Book of the Secrets of Enoch*, a Jewish apocalypse written in Greek in the first century of our era (now only extant in a Sclavonic version). In chap. viii. of this work we find that Paradise is explicitly located in the "third heaven," which is the view recognised here by St. Paul (see Charles' *Sclavonic Enoch*, pp. xxxi. ff.).

Vv. 3, 4. **καὶ οἶδα τὸν τοιοῦτον κ.τ.λ.**: *and I know such a man* (he speaks with such caution and reticence of this

i Reff. xi. 30. k Reff. xi. 16. l Reff. i. 23. m Reff. i. 8. n 2 Thess. ii. 4 only. o Here only. p Reff. ii. 11. q Mark iv. 65; 1 Cor. iv. 11.

οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλῆσαι. 5. ὑπὲρ τοῦ τοιούτου καυχήσομαι· ὑπὲρ[1] δὲ ἐμαυτοῦ οὐ καυχήσομαι, εἰ μὴ ἐν ταῖς [i]ἀσθενείαις μου.[2] 6. ἐὰν γὰρ θελήσω καυχήσασθαι, οὐκ ἔσομαι [k]ἄφρων· ἀλήθειαν γὰρ ἐρῶ· [l]φείδομαι δὲ, μή τις εἰς ἐμὲ λογίσηται ὑπὲρ ὃ βλέπει με, ἢ [3]ἀκούει τι ἐξ ἐμοῦ.

7. Καὶ τῇ [m]ὑπερβολῇ τῶν ἀποκαλύψεων ἵνα[4] μὴ [n]ὑπεραίρωμαι,[5] ἐδόθη μοι [o]σκόλοψ τῇ σαρκὶ, ἄγγελος [p]Σατᾶν[6] ἵνα με [q]κολαφίζῃ,

[1] D* has περι δε for υπερ δε.

[2] BD* 17, 67**, d, e, the Syriac and Bohairic vss. om. μου; ins. ℵDcEGKLMP, f, g, vg. (*cf.* ver. 9).

[3] ℵcD*E*KLP, d, e, f and the Harclean support ακουει τι; better om. τι with ℵ*BDcE**G 17, 37, g, the Peshitto and Bohairic vss.

[4] The best authorities ℵABG 17 read διο before ινα; it is omitted by DEKLP, the Latin and Syriac vss., "a characteristic Western attempt to deal with a difficulty by excision" (Hort).

[5] DELP give υπεραιρομαι.

[6] ℵcA**DbcEKLP and the Harclean margin support Σαταν; better Σατανα with ℵ*A*BD*G 17*, 67**, the Bohairic and Latin vss. (Σαταν is indecl. in 1 Kings xi. 14, but the form in N.T. is always the declinable Σατανας).

momentous event in his spiritual life that he will not even describe it in the first person) . . . *how that he was caught up into Paradise* (see previous note), *and heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter;* such words are reserved for the Divine voice which speaks to man, although this restriction does not apply to *all* Divine words.

Ver. 5. **ὑπὲρ τοῦ τοιούτου κ.τ.λ.**: *on behalf of such an one will I glory, but on mine own behalf, i.e.*, of myself in my normal state, *I will not glory save in my weaknesses*, as he has already done, xi. 23 ff.

Ver. 6. **ἐὰν γὰρ θελήσω καυχ. κ.τ.λ.**: we must supply a suppressed clause: "And yet, as you see, if I *did* choose to boast, I should keep within the truth" is the sense. *For if I should desire to glory, I shall not be foolish* (*cf.* xi. 1 and ver. 11), *for I shall speak the truth* (xi. 31); *but I forbear, lest any man should account of me above that which he seeth me to be or heareth from me.* He is anxious that he should be judged, *not* by his report of his own spiritual experiences, but by his laborious and painful life in the service of the Gospel. It is instructive to notice that he does not bring forward this vision as *evidence* of the truth of doctrine; he only mentions it incidentally and with reserve as a Divine manifestation of which he might legitimately boast, if he chose. On the other hand, he appeals to the fact that he had seen the Risen Christ (1 Cor. ix. 1, xv. 8) as of great evidential importance, which indicates that he believed *that* vision to be "objective" in a sense in which the visions of an ecstatic trance are not.

Vv. 7-10. His "thorn in the flesh".—Ver. 7. **καὶ τῇ ὑπερβ. τῶν ἀποκ.** If we read **διό,** these words ought either to be taken with the concluding words of ver. 6 (as by W.H.), or—regarding ver. 6 as a parenthesis—with ver. 5 (as by Lachmann). Neither gives a satisfactory sense, and we therefore follow the R.V. in regarding the construction as broken. He says *and by reason of the exceeding greatness of the revelations*—and then suddenly changes the form of the sentence.—**διὸ ἵνα μὴ ὑπεραίρ. κ.τ.λ.**: *wherefore, that I should not be exalted overmuch, there was given to me, sc.*, by God (as at 1 Cor. xi. 15, xii. 7, Gal. iii. 21), *a thorn in the flesh, an angel of Satan* (who is regarded as having power over the **σάρξ,** Luke xiii. 16, 1 Cor. v. 5, Job ii. 5), *that he might buffet me* (see reff.), the pres. tense indicating that this "buffeting" was not a single isolated trial but continual, *that I should not be exalted overmuch.* In classical Greek **σκόλοψ** means a "stake," and this is given as an alternative rendering in the R.V. margin. Thus the Apostle's trial would be likened to a continual "impalement". Stanley, who adopts this rendering, compares Gal. ii. 20 "I am crucified with Christ". But in the Greek of the

ἵνα[1] μὴ [n]ὑπεραίρωμαι. 8. ὑπὲρ[2] τούτου τρὶς[3] τὸν Κύριον παρε- r Luke iv. 13; 1 Tim. vi. 5.
κάλεσα, ἵνα [r]ἀποστῇ ἀπ' ἐμοῦ· 9. καὶ εἴρηκέ μοι, [s]Ἀρκεῖ σοι ἡ s John xiv. 8; 1 Tim. vi. 8.
χάρις μου· ἡ γὰρ δύναμίς μου[4] ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ τελειοῦται.[5] ἥδιστα
οὖν μᾶλλον καυχήσομαι ἐν ταῖς ἀσθενείαις μου,[6] ἵνα [t]ἐπισκηνώσῃ t Here only.

[1] The second **ινα μη υπεραιρ.** is omitted by ℵ*ADEG 17 and the Latin vss.; but is found in ℵᶜBKLP, the Syriac and Bohairic vss., and is printed by Tisch. and W.H.

[2] A has **και υπερ.** [3] D*E, d, e and the Bohairic give **τον Κυρ. τριϛ.**

[4] ℵᶜA²DᵇᶜEKLP, the Syriac and Bohairic vss. support **μου** after **δυν.**; better om. with ℵ*A*BD*G and the Latins, but the sense is not affected.

[5] **τελειουται,** ℵᶜDᶜEKLP; better **τελειται** with ℵ*ABD*G.

[6] B 67**, the Harclean and Bohairic vss. om. **μου** after **ασθ.**; ins. ℵADEGKLP, the Latin, Peshitto and Sahidic vss.

LXX (see Num. xxxiii. 55, Hosea ii. 8, Ecclus. xliii. 19) **σκόλοψ** undoubtedly means "thorn," not "stake" (Ezek. xxviii. 24 is, perhaps, doubtful). Illustrations of its use in this sense also occur in Artemidorus, Babrius and the medical writers (see Field *in loc.* and *Hermathena*, xix., p. 390); *e.g.*, of the pain of cutting a tooth it is said **ὅταν ἐμπεπαρμένος ᾖ σκόλοψ σαρκί** (*Comm. in aph. Hippocr.*, 25). We hold, then, that **σκόλοψ** here certainly means "thorn," and that St. Paul's trial is compared to the vexatious irritation of a thorn rather than to the agonising and fatal torture of impalement on a stake. We have no knowledge as to what this trial was. It is a mere fancy, and not a happy one (probably suggested by the Latin *stimulus carnis*), that it consisted in violence of sensual passions (*cf. contra* 1 Cor. vii. 7-9 and ver. 9 below). That the **σκόλοψ** is an individual opponent who was a "thorn in his side" (*cf.* x. 7, xi. 14) was held by Chrysostom; Ephraim Syrus identifies him with Alexander the coppersmith (2 Tim. iv. 14)! But this guess hardly explains **σαρκί**; the trial was not of the spirit, but *in the flesh*. It seems likely on the whole that it was a bodily infirmity, probably the **ἀσθένεια τῆς σαρκός** of Gal. iv. 13. Jerome (*Gal.*, iv., 13) and Tertullian (*de Pudic.*, 13) mention the tradition that it was *headache;* this was probably (if there be any truth in the tradition) only a symptom. Another view (supported by the Celtic name for the disease) is *epilepsy*, a disease to which "visionaries" are said to be prone, but which afflicted two such strong men as Napoleon and Peter the Great. Those who hold this view generally point to the circumstances of St. Paul's conversion as illustrating an attack of the disorder. But *this* at least is excluded by the Apostle's own words; the "thorn in the flesh" was "given" him *after* the "vision" of fourteen years before; *i.e.*, this infirmity came upon him *after* the year 41. Another plausible conjecture (see Farrar, *St. Paul*, Excurs. xi., but *cf.* Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 39) is that the Apostle suffered from *ophthalmia* (*cf.* Acts ix. 9, Gal. iv. 15, vi. 11), a very common disease in the East. Prof. Ramsay (*loc. cit.*, p. 94 ff.) thinks it was chronic malarial fever. Whatever his infirmity was, it apparently affected the dignity of his outward appearance (Gal. iv. 14), and was evident to the eye. For a full discussion of the various theories on the subject see Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 186 ff.

Ver. 8. **ὑπὲρ τούτου τρὶς κ.τ.λ.**: *concerning this thing* (or "this angel"; for **ὑπέρ** = "concerning" see on i. 8) *I besought the Lord, i.e.*, Christ (see ver. 9), *thrice that it* (or "he") *might depart from me*. "Thrice" seems to point to three special occasions, when his prayers for the removal of his trial were specially urgent. Like Another who prayed thrice that the cup of suffering might pass from Him (Matt. xxvi. 44), St. Paul did not receive the answer his spirit longed for. But he did receive an answer abundantly sufficient to strengthen and to console.

Ver. 9. **καὶ εἴρηκέ μοι κ.τ.λ.**: *and He hath said* (note the perf. as expressing the abiding validity of the Divine promise; so often in quotations from the O.T., *e.g.*, Acts xiii. 34, Heb. iv. 4, x. 9) *to me*, "*My grace is sufficient for thee* (*cf.* Isa. xliii. 2), *for My power is being made perfect* (**τελεῖσθαι** is found here only; the tense indicates a continuous fact in St. Paul's life) *in weakness*". So it is said of Christ that He was "made perfect through sufferings" (Heb. ii. 10);

u Reff. v. 8. v Reff. xi. 30. w Reff. vi. 4. x Acts xiii. 50; Rom. viii. 35; 2 Thess. i. 4; 2 Tim. iii. 11. y Reff. xi. 21. z Reff. xi. 16. a Reff. iii. 1. b Reff. xi. 5. c Reff. iv. 17. d Reff. viii. 7.

ἐπ᾽ ἐμὲ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Χριστοῦ. 10. διὸ [u] εὐδοκῶ ἐν [v] ἀσθενείαις, ἐν ὕβρεσιν, ἐν [w] ἀνάγκαις, ἐν [x] διωγμοῖς,[1] ἐν [2] [w] στενοχωρίαις, ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ· ὅταν γὰρ [y] ἀσθενῶ, τότε δυνατός εἰμι. 11. Γέγονα [z] ἄφρων καυχώμενος[3]· ὑμεῖς με ἠναγκάσατε. ἐγὼ γὰρ ὤφειλον ὑφ᾽ ὑμῶν [a] συνίστασθαι· οὐδὲν γὰρ [4] [b] ὑστέρησα τῶν [b] ὑπὲρ λίαν [b] ἀποστόλων, εἰ καὶ οὐδέν εἰμι.

12. Τὰ μὲν σημεῖα τοῦ ἀποστόλου [c] κατειργάσθη[5] ἐν ὑμῖν ἐν [d] πάσῃ

[1] A om. **εν διωγμοις.**

[2] ℵ[c]DEGKLP support **εν στεν.**; better **και στεν.** with ℵ*B.

[3] LP and the Syriac vss. support the explanatory gloss **καυχωμενος** after **αφρ.** om. ℵABDEGK, the Latin and Egyptian vss.

[4] B ins. **τι** after **γαρ** (W.H. place it in their margin); G has **ου γαρ.**

[5] ℵAB[3]KL support **κατειργασθη**; B*DEG have **κατηργασθε.**

and of the power which He communicates from Himself the same law holds good. *Cf.* Isa. xl. 29-31.—**ἥδιστα οὖν κ.τ.λ.**: *most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my weaknesses* (*sc.*, rather than that they should be removed), *that the power of Christ* (see on vi. 7 and reff. there) *may rest upon me*, lit., "may spread a tabernacle over me". The image is that of the Shechinah or **σκηνή**, the glory which was the symbol of the Divine presence in the Holy of Holies, descending upon the faithful (*cf.* John i. 14, Rev. vii. 15, xxi. 3). The two renderings ("strength" and "power") of **δύναμις** in the A.V. of this verse are preserved (although interchanged) in the R.V. by a curious inadvertence on the part of the Revisers, who are generally scrupulous even to pedantry in maintaining uniformity in such matters.

Ver. 10. **διὸ εὐδοκῶ κ.τ.λ.**: *wherefore I am well content in* (for **εὐδοκεῖν ἐν** *cf.* 2 Sam. xxii. 20, Matt. iii. 17, 1 Cor. x. 5) *weaknesses, in insults* (**ὕβρις** is used for "injury" to a ship in Acts xxvii. 10, 21; it does not occur elsewhere in N.T.; but *cf.* **ὑβρίζειν**, Acts xiv. 5, 1 Thess. ii. 2), *in necessities, in persecutions and distresses, for Christ's sake* (*cf.* Matt. v. 11); *for whenever I am weak, then am I strong*. Wetstein compares Philo's **τὸ ἀσθενὲς ὑμῶν δύναμίς ἐστι** (*Vit. Mos.*, i., § 13). St. Paul's words are more than a verbal paradox: they express the fact, to which history abundantly testifies, that the world's throne is the Cross.

Vv. 11-13. The foregoing Testimony to his Claims ought to have come from the Corinthians who witnessed his Apostolic Labours.—Ver. 11. **γέγονα ἄφρων· ὑμεῖς κ.τ.λ.**: *I am become foolish, sc.*, boasting thus: *ye compelled me, i.e.*, it was your doing; *for I ought to have been commended by you* (*cf.* iii. 1, 1 Cor. ix. 1), *i.e.*, you should not have left it to me to speak my own praises: *for in nothing was I behind the superfine Apostles*, whom you trust so readily, *although I am nothing, sc.*, in God's eyes (*cf.* John viii. 54, 1 Cor. iii. 7). Of the Apostles properly so called, St. Paul calls himself **ὁ ἐλάχιστος** (1 Cor. xv. 9); but he will not admit for a moment the superiority of the Corinthian Judaisers.

Ver. 12. **τὰ μὲν σημεῖα κ.τ.λ.**: *truly* (there is no antithesis to **μέν**) *the signs of an Apostle* (**τοῦ** is generic, "such as might be expected from an Apostle"; *cf.* Mark. xvi. 20) *were wrought* (note the passive; he does not claim to be anything more than God's instrument; **οὐδέν ἐστι**) *among you in all patience, sc.*, on my part (**ὑπομονή** is an essential quality for a Christian missionary; see on i. 6), *in signs and wonders and powers*. This direct assertion, made as if it were indisputable, that miracles had been wrought at Corinth through his agency (see also Rom. xv. 19, 1 Cor. ii. 4) is noteworthy. The three words used should be distinguished. **τέρας** is something anomalous, outside the ordinary course of nature. This, however, is not the prominent idea in the N.T. miracles; **τέρας** is *never* used in the N.T. (save in the quotation Acts ii. 19) except in combination with **σημεῖον** = a "sign" of the Divine purpose. **σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα** is the regular phrase both in O.T. (Exod. vii. 3, etc.) and in the N.T. for

[c] ὑπομονῇ, ἐν[1] [f]σημείοις καὶ [f]τέρασι καὶ [f]δυνάμεσι. 13. τί γάρ ἐστιν ὃ ἡττήθητε[2] ὑπὲρ[3] τὰς λοιπὰς ἐκκλησίας; εἰ μὴ ὅτι αὐτὸς[4] ἐγὼ οὐ [g]κατενάρκησα ὑμῶν· [h]χαρίσασθε μοι τὴν ἀδικίαν ταύτην. 14. ἰδοὺ τρίτον[5] [i]ἑτοίμως [i]ἔχω ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, καὶ οὐ [k]καταναρκήσω ὑμῶν[6]· οὐ γὰρ [l]ζητῶ τὰ ὑμῶν, ἀλλ' ὑμᾶς. οὐ γὰρ ὀφείλει τὰ τέκνα τοῖς γονεῦσι [m]θησαυρίζειν, ἀλλ' οἱ γονεῖς τοῖς τέκνοις· 15. ἐγὼ δὲ ἥδιστα δαπανήσω[7] καὶ [n]ἐκδαπανηθήσομαι ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν· εἰ καὶ[8] περισσοτέρως ὑμᾶς ἀγαπῶν[9] [o]ἧττον ἀγαπῶμαι.

[c] Reff. i. 6. [f] Acts ii. 22; Rom. xv. 19; 2 Thess. ii. 9; Heb. ii. 4. [g] Chap. xi. 8 only. [h] Reff. ii. 7. [i] Acts xxi. 13; Dan. iii. 15. [k] Chap. xi. 8 only. [l] 1 Cor. x. 24, 33, xiii. 5; Phil. ii. 21. [m] 1 Cor. xvi. 2. [n] Here only. [o] 1 Cor. xi. 17 only.

[1] DcEKLP and the Bohairic support **εν σημειοις**; ℵaAD*, d, e, f and the Harclean give **σημειοις**; G, g and the Peshitto **και σημ.**; ℵc **τε σημ.**; better **σημειοις τε** with ℵ*B 17, 73.

[2] ℵcADbcKLP support **ηττηθητε**; better **ησσωθητε** with ℵ*BD*.

[3] DE give **παρα** for **υπερ**. [4] G and the Latin vss. give **εγω αυτος**.

[5] ℵABG, the Latin, Syriac and Sahidic vss. have **τριτον τουτο** (DE and the Bohairic give **τουτο τριτον**); om. **τουτο** KLP (*cf.* xiii. 1).

[6] DbcEKL, the Latin, Syriac and Egyptian vss. support **καταναρκ. υμων**; D*G have **υμας** for **υμων**; om. **υμων** ℵAB 17, 73.

[7] D*E, d, e add **και εκδαπανησω** after **δαπανησω**.

[8] NcDbcEKLP, f, vg. and the Syriac vss. support **ει και**; om. **ει και** D*d, e, g; om. **και** ℵ*ABG 17 and the Egyptian vss.

[9] ℵcBDEGKLP and the Latin vss. support **αγαπων**; better **αγαπω** with ℵ*A 17 and the Egyptian vss.

"miracles"; but it is their *signal* rather than their *wonderful* character upon which stress is laid. To describe them as **δυνάμεις** (Matt. vii. 22, Acts xix. 11, 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28) directs attention to the Omnipotent Being to whom they are due.

Ver. 13. **τί γάρ ἐστιν ὃ ἡσσ. κ.τ.λ.**: *for what is there wherein ye were treated as inferior* (*cf.* 2 Pet. ii. 19) *to the rest of the churches, except indeed that I myself did not burden you? Cf.* Acts xx. 33, 1 Cor. ix. 12 and ver. 16. The emphatic **αὐτὸς ἐγώ** may indicate that it was only he himself (and not his colleagues) who refused maintenance (see on xi. 12). This was the only **σημεῖον τοῦ ἀποστόλου** which he did not exhibit at Corinth, and he ironically adds, *Forgive me this wrong.*

Vv. 14-18. THAT HE DID NOT CLAIM MAINTENANCE AT CORINTH WAS DISINTERESTED ON HIS PART.—Ver. 14. **ἰδοὺ τρίτον τοῦτο κ.τ.λ.**: *behold this is the third time that I am ready to come to you.* While these words only express that he had been *ready* to go twice before, they are quite consistent with the hypothesis, required by xiii. 1, 2 and ii. 1 (see *Introd.*, p. 5), that he had actually *paid* two previous visits to Corinth, the first of which is described in Acts xviii. That we have no details of the second is no argument against its having taken place.—**καὶ οὐ καταναρκ. κ.τ.λ.**: *and I will not be a burden to you*, following in this my practice on the two former occasions; *for I seek not yours but you; for the children are not bound to lay up for the parents*, in which relation he stands to them (1 Cor. iv. 14 f., *cf.* Gal. iv. 19), *but the parents for the children* (*cf.* Prov. xix. 14). See on xi. 12 for St. Paul's principles of action in this matter.

Ver. 15. **ἐγὼ δὲ ἥδιστα κ.τ.λ.**: *and I will most gladly spend and be wholly spent for your souls' sake* (*cf.* chap. i. 6, Rom. ix. 3, Phil. ii. 17, 1 Thess. ii. 8, 2 Tim. ii. 10 for the like expressions of unselfish devotion). **ψυχή** is here used (as at Heb. xiii. 17, 1 Pet. ii. 11) of the spiritual part of man, the interests of which are eternal.—**εἰ περισσοτέρως ὑμᾶς ἀγαπῶ κ.τ.λ.**: *if I loved you more abundantly, i.e.*, than I love other Churches of my foundation (*cf.* xi. 11), *am I loved less* (*sc.*, than I am loved by other Churches)? Is it thus that you requite my affection?

Ver. 16. **ἔστω δὲ κ.τ.λ.**: *but be it so!*

16. Ἔστω δὲ, ἐγὼ οὐ [p] κατεβάρησα[1] ὑμᾶς, ἀλλ' ὑπάρχων [q] πανοῦργος [r] δόλῳ ὑμᾶς ἔλαβον. 17. μή τινα ὧν ἀπέσταλκα πρὸς ὑμᾶς, δι'[2] αὐτοῦ [s] ἐπλεονέκτησα ὑμᾶς; 18. παρεκάλεσα Τίτον, καὶ [t] συναπέστειλα τὸν ἀδελφόν[3]· μή τι ἐπλεονέκτησεν ὑμᾶς Τίτος; οὐ τῷ αὐτῷ πνεύματι περιεπατήσαμεν[4]; οὐ τοῖς αὐτοῖς [u] ἴχνεσι; 19. Πάλιν[5] δοκεῖτε ὅτι ὑμῖν [v] ἀπολογούμεθα; [w] κατενώπιον[6] τοῦ[7] [w] Θεοῦ [w] ἐν [w] Χριστῷ [w] λαλοῦμεν· τὰ δὲ πάντα, [x] ἀγαπητοὶ, ὑπὲρ τῆς

p Here only.
q Here only; *cf.* iv. 2.
r Rom. i. 29; 1 Thess. ii. 3.
s Reff. ii. 11.
t Here only.
u Rom. iv. 12; 1 Pet. ii. 21.
v Acts xxiv. 10; Rom. ii. 15.
w Chap. ii. 17.
x Reff. vii. 1.

[1] ℵG have κατεναρκησα υμων (from ver. 13) for κατεβαρησα υμας.

[2] G, f, g, vg. om. δι' αυτου.

[3] Some editions of the Peshitto suggest αδελφους for αδελφον, but it is doubtful if there is a Greek variant behind their texts.

[4] G, g add after περιεπατησαμεν (from xiii. 2), οτι εαν ελθω παλιν ου φεισομαι.

[5] ℵcDEKLP, g, the Syriac and Bohairic vss. support παλιν; better παλαι with ℵ*ABG 17, 67**, d, e, f, vg. with a period after απολογ.

[6] DEKLP support κατενωπιον; better κατεναντι with ℵABG (*cf.* ii. 17).

[7] ℵcDbcEKL support του Θεου; better om. του with ℵ*ABD*GP 17, 37 (*cf.* ii. 17).

I did not myself burden you (*cf.* xi. 9 and ver. 13). This the Corinthians grant as indisputable, but they allege a sinister reason, *viz.*, *being crafty* (for ὑπάρχων see on viii. 17) *I caught you* (see on xi. 20) *with guile* (*cf.* iv. 2, μὴ περιπατοῦντες ἐν πανουργίᾳ μηδὲ δολοῦντες κ.τ.λ.). That is, his adversaries hinted that, although he did not accept maintenance directly, yet the collection made for the Judæan Christians was under his hand, and that he was not above suspicion in his disposal of it. To this he returns an indignant denial, and appeals directly to their own observation of the messengers whom he had sent, of whom Titus (at least) had met him in Macedonia with a report (vii. 6) and was sent back to Corinth with two companions to complete the business, carrying this letter (viii. 6, 18 ff.).

Ver. 17. μή τινα ὧν κ.τ.λ.: *of those whom* (ὧν by attraction for ἐκείνων οὕς) *I have sent, was there one by whom I took advantage of you?* The constr. is broken, and the resulting anacoluthon is one of the most striking in St. Paul's writings (*cf.* Rom. viii. 3, Gal. i. 20).

Ver. 18. παρεκάλεσα Τίτον κ.τ.λ.: *I exhorted Titus* (see on viii. 6), *and I sent the brother with him.* This was the mission from which Titus' return is recorded above (vii. 6). We do not know the name of his companion; but it is highly probable that Titus and this ἀδελφός are the ἀδελφοί who were the bearers of the former letter to Corinth (1 Cor. xvi. 12). —μή τι ἐπλεονέκτ. κ.τ.λ.: *surely Titus took no advantage of you? walked we not* (*i.e.*, Titus my emissary and I myself) *by the same spirit and in the same steps?* It is plain that Titus' first mission had been admirably fulfilled, and that the Corinthians had recognised his single-mindedness and sincerity (see vii. 13). To their good opinion of him St. Paul might fairly point, for Titus, after all, had only carried out *his* instructions.

Vv. 19-21. His Glorying has not been by way of Apology, but to edify them unto Repentance. — Ver. 19. πάλαι δοκεῖτε κ.τ.λ.: *ye are thinking this long time* (*i.e.*, since they read xi. 1 ff.; for πάλαι *cf.* Matt. xi. 21, Heb. i. 1, 2 Pet. i. 9) *that we are excusing ourselves to you*, which is very far from his intention (*cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 3). On the contrary, *in the sight of God speak we in Christ* (as he had said before, ii. 17). *But all the things, sc.*, which we speak, *beloved, are for your edifying, sc.*, of which you sorely stand in need.

Ver. 20. φοβοῦμαι γὰρ κ.τ.λ.: *for I fear lest by any means, when I come, I should find you not such as I would, and should myself be found of you such as ye would not, i.e.*, indignant to severity at their backsliding (*cf.* x. 2), *lest by any means there should be strife* (*cf.* 1 Cor. i. 11, iii. 3), *jealousy, ragings* (this seems to be the force of the plur. θυμοί; *cf.* Wisd. vii. 20), *factions* (ἐριθεῖα is derived from ἔρῑθος, a hired labourer, and signifies a

ὑμῶν [y] οἰκοδομῆς. 20. [z] φοβοῦμαι γὰρ, [z] μή [z] πως ἐλθὼν οὐχ οἵους [y] θέλω εὕρω ὑμᾶς, κἀγὼ εὑρεθῶ ὑμῖν οἷον οὐ θέλετε· μή πως [a] ἔρεις,[1] [b] ζῆλοι,[2] [c] θυμοὶ, [d] ἐριθεῖαι, [e] καταλαλιαὶ, [f] ψιθυρισμοὶ, [g] φυσιώσεις, [h] ἀκαταστασίαι· 21. μὴ πάλιν ἐλθόντα[3] με ταπεινώσῃ[4] [i] ὁ [i] Θεός [i] μου πρὸς ὑμᾶς, καὶ πενθήσω πολλοὺς τῶν [k] προημαρτηκότων, καὶ μὴ μετανοησάντων ἐπὶ τῇ [l m n] ἀκαθαρσίᾳ καὶ [l m o] πορνείᾳ καὶ [l n] ἀσελγείᾳ [c] ᾗ ἔπραξαν.

y Reff. x. 8. z Reff. xi. 3. a Rom. i. 29, xiii. 13; Gal. v. 20; Phil. i. 15. b Rom. xiii. 13; 1 Cor. iii. 3; Gal. v. 20. c Rom. ii. 8; Gal. v. 20; Eph. iv. 31; Col. ii. 8. d Rom. ii. 8; Gal. v. 20; Phil. i. 17, ii. 3. e 1 Pet. ii. 1 only; Wisd. i. 11. f Here only; *cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 6, 18, v. 2, viii. 1. g Here only; *cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 6, 18, v. 2, viii. 1. h Reff. vi. 5. i Rom. i. 8; Phil. i. 3, iv. 19; Philm. 4. k Chap. xiii. 2 only. l Gal. v. 19. m Eph. v. 3; Col. iii. 5. n Eph. iv. 19. o 1 Cor. v. 1, vi. 13, 18, vii. 2.

[1] BDEGKLP, the Latin, Egyptian and Harclean vss. give **ερεις**; Tisch. and W.H. read **ερις** with ℵA 17 and the Peshitto.

[2] ℵDᵇᶜEKLP, the Latin, Egyptian and Harclean vss. support **ζηλοι**; Tisch. and W.H. read **ζηλος** with ABD*G 17 and the Peshitto.

[3] ℵᶜDᶜKL support **ελθοντα με**; better **ελθοντος μου** with ℵ*ABGP, placing **με** after **ταπειν.**

[4] ℵAK support **ταπεινωσῃ**; BDEGLP have **ταπεινωσει.**

mercenary cabal), *backbitings*, *whisperings* (*i.e.*, open and secret defamation of character), *swellings*, *i.e.*, insolences, *tumults* (see on vi. 5). *Cf.* Jas. iii. 16, **ὅπου γὰρ ζῆλος καὶ ἐριθεία, ἐκεῖ ἀκαταστασία.**

Ver. 21. **μὴ πάλιν ἐλθόντος μου κ.τ.λ.**: *lest when I come, my God should humble me again before you, sc.*, because of the scanty fruit of his preaching (as had been the case on his *second* visit), *and I should mourn for many* (observe, not "all") *that have sinned heretofore*, *i.e.*, before my second visit, *and did not repent*, *i.e.*, after my second visit (we thus retain the force of the aorist part; for **μετανοέω** see on vii. 9, and for **μετανοεῖν ἐπὶ** *cf.* Joel ii. 13, Amos vii. 3), *of the uncleanness and fornication and lasciviousness which they committed.* There is nothing in the anxiety here expressed which is inconsistent with the language of vii. 9 ff. *There* he expresses his satisfaction that in the matter of the incestuous person the Corinthians had obeyed his directions; but their proneness to sins of the flesh he is fully alive to. See, *e.g.*, vi. 14, vii. 1.

CHAPTER XIII. — Vv. 1-10. IF HE COMES AGAIN, HE WILL NOT SPARE: CHRIST IS HIS STRENGTH: LET THE CORINTHIANS SEE TO IT THAT HE BE THEIRS ALSO. — Ver. 1. **τρίτον τοῦτο κ.τ.λ.**: *this is the third time I am coming to you.* "*At the mouth of two witnesses or three shall every word be established.*" That is, he will hold a formal enquiry in the strict legal way (see reff.) when he arrives. No evasions will be possible.

Ver. 2. **προείρηκα καὶ προλ. κ.τ.λ.**: *I have said beforehand* (at chap. x. 6, 11, xii. 21), *and I do say beforehand, as when I was present the second time* (*cf.* ii. 1, xii. 14), *so now being absent, to them that have sinned heretofore*, *i.e.*, before my second visit (as at xii. 21), *and to all the rest*, *i.e.*, any more recent offenders, *that if I come again I will not spare.* It was "to spare" them that he had paid hitherto no further visit after his second (i. 23). He proceeds to give the reason why he will not "spare" if such a visit should be necessary; *viz.*, they have challenged his Apostolic authority.

Ver. 3. **ἐπεὶ δοκιμὴν κ.τ.λ.**: *seeing that ye seek a proof of Christ speaking in me* (*cf.* Matt. x. 20), *i.e.*, a proof that I am really an "Apostle" with a "mission" from Christ to speak in His Name. This last thought leads him into a short digression. "He who has thus commissioned me is not weak, but strong, and this paradoxical strength in weakness is mine also" (vv. 3ᵇ, 4).—**ὃς εἰς ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ.**: *who is not weak in relation to you, sc.*, as you think me to be (x. 10, xi. 21), *but is powerful in your midst.* And this is true for two reasons: (*a*) because of His Resurrection, as the Victor over Death; (*b*) because of the strength with which He empowers us in the discharge of our duty to you. Each of these reasons is now introduced by **καὶ γάρ.**

XIII. 1. [a]Τρίτον[1] [a]τοῦτο ἔρχομαι[2] πρὸς ὑμᾶς· "[b]ἐπὶ[3] [b]στόματος δύο μαρτύρων καὶ[4] τριῶν σταθήσεται πᾶν ῥῆμα". 2. [c]προείρηκα[5] καὶ [d]προλέγω ὡς[6] παρὼν τὸ δεύτερον, καὶ ἀπὼν νῦν γράφω[7] τοῖς [e]προημαρτηκόσι, καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς πᾶσιν, ὅτι, ἐὰν ἔλθω εἰς τὸ πάλιν, οὐ [f]φείσομαι· 3. ἐπεὶ[8] [g]δοκιμὴν ζητεῖτε τοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ λαλοῦντος Χριστοῦ, ὃς εἰς ὑμᾶς οὐκ [h]ἀσθενεῖ, ἀλλὰ [i]δυνατεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν. 4. καὶ γὰρ εἰ[9] [k]ἐσταυρώθη ἐξ [l]ἀσθενείας, ἀλλὰ ζῇ ἐκ [m]δυνάμεως [m]Θεοῦ[10]· καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἡμεῖς [n]ἀσθενοῦμεν ἐν[11] αὐτῷ, ἀλλὰ

a Chap. xii. 14; Num. xxii. 28; Judges xvi. 15; John xxi. 14.
b Deut. xix. 15 (Matt. xviii. 16; 1 Tim. v. 19).
c Chap. vii. 3.
d Gal. v. 21; 1 Thess. iii. 4.
e Chap. xii. 21 only.
f Reff. i. 23.
g Reff. ii. 9.
h Reff. xi. 21.
i Rom. xiv. 4; chap. ix. 8 only.
k 1 Cor. i. 23, ii. 2, 8; Gal. iii. 1.
l Reff. xi. 30.
m Reff. vi. 7.
n Reff. xi. 21.

[1] ℵ[c]A 17, vg. prefix **ιδου** to **τριτον** (from xii. 14).

[2] A and the Peshitto read (from xii. 14) **ετοιμως εχω ελθειν** for **ερχομαι.**

[3] ℵ*, g and the Syriac vss. prefix **ινα** to **επι στ.**

[4] ℵ, f, vg. read **η τρ.** (as at Matt. xviii. 16, 1 Tim. v. 19) for **και τρ.**

[5] D*E add **γαρ** after **προειρ.**

[6] D*, d, e and the Harclean om. **ως** before **παρων.**

[7] D[c]EKLP and the Syriac have **γραφω** (from ver. 10); om. ℵABD*G 17 and the Latins.

[8] f, vg. have *an* for **επει,** and there is Patristic testimony to a variant **ει.**

[9] So ℵ[c]AD[bc]EL, f, vg. and the Syriac; better om. **ει** with ℵ*BD*GKP 17, d, e, g and the Bohairic.

[10] 17 om. **Θεου**; so also Hilary.

[11] BDEKLP, d, e, vg. and the Harclean give **ασθεν. εν αυτω**; better **συν** for **εν** with ℵAG, f, g, the Peshitto and Bohairic.

Ver. 4. (*a*) **καὶ γὰρ ἐσταυρώθη κ.τ.λ.**: *for He was crucified through weakness* (*cf.* Phil. ii. 8, 1 Pet. iii. 18; **ἐκ** indicating that it was His self-assumed **ἀσθένεια** which made the Passion possible), *but liveth through* (**ἐκ** again indicating the ultimate condition) *the Power of God* (see reff. and *cf.* Rom. viii. 11, Eph. i. 20, Phil. ii. 9).—(*b*) **καὶ γὰρ ἡμεῖς κ.τ.λ.**: *for we also are weak with Him* (the reading **ἐν αὐτῷ** might be explained from such passages as i. 5, iv. 10, 11; but it is so startling that we hesitate to adopt it, when the MS. evidence is so evenly balanced; **σὺν αὐτῷ** means simply "we are weak, as He was weak, in the world's eyes"; see xii. 10), *but we shall live with Him*, not only in the Resurrection Life of believers (John xiv. 19, Rom. v. 10, vi. 8), but *through the Power of God toward you*, *i.e.*, through the powerful sanctions with which He will confirm our exercise of Apostolic discipline at Corinth (*cf.* 1 Cor. v. 5). The thought is that already expressed in xii. 10. He now resumes the argument of ver. 3[a], *sc.*, you are claiming to test *my* claims: you should look to yourselves; *your* faith is a witness to mine—that Christ dwells in you is a proof that He dwells in me, who preached Him to you. *Cf.* chap. i. 24, iii. 2.

Ver. 5. **ἑαυτοὺς πειράζετε κ.τ.λ.**: *try your own selves* (**πειράζειν** generally has a sinister sense in the N.T. = "to tempt," as at 1 Cor. vii. 5, x. 9, Gal. vi. 1, 1 Thess. iii. 5; but see reff.) *whether ye be in the Faith*, *sc.*, the objective Christian Creed (*cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 13); *prove your own selves* (**δοκιμάζειν** goes back to **δοκιμή** of ver. 3; *cf.* also **ἀδόκιμοι** at the end of this verse). *Or know ye not as to your own selves that Jesus Christ is in you?* (*cf.* Rom. viii. 10, Gal. iv. 19) *unless indeed*, *sc.*, which is certainly not the case (for **εἰ μή τι** *cf.* Luke ix. 13, 1 Cor. vii. 5) *ye are reprobate.* **ἀδόκιμος** is that which will not satisfy a test, and so = *reprobus*. Their own consciousness of the power of Christ's grace is the best proof that his preaching to them was Divinely authorised; he "begat them in Christ Jesus" (1 Cor. iv. 15).

Ver. 6. **ἐλπίζω δὲ κ.τ.λ.**: *but*, however it may be with you, *I hope that ye shall know that we are not reprobate*, that

ζησόμεθα[1] σὺν[2] αὐτῷ ἐκ[3] [m]δυνάμεως [m]Θεοῦ εἰς[4] ὑμᾶς. 5. ἑαυτοὺς [o]πειράζετε εἰ ἐστὲ ἐν τῇ πίστει, ἑαυτοὺς[5] [p]δοκιμάζετε. ἢ[6] οὐκ [q]ἐπιγινώσκετε ἑαυτούς, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς[7] Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστιν[8]; εἰ μήτι [r]ἀδόκιμοί ἐστε. 6. ἐλπίζω δὲ ὅτι γνώσεσθε ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἐσμὲν ἀδόκιμοι. 7. [s]εὐχόμαι[9] δὲ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν, μὴ ποιῆσαι ὑμᾶς κακὸν μηδὲν, οὐχ ἵνα ἡμεῖς [t]δόκιμοι φανῶμεν, ἀλλ' ἵνα ὑμεῖς [u]τὸ [u]καλὸν ποιῆτε,[10] ἡμεῖς δὲ ὡς ἀδόκιμοι ὦμεν. 8. οὐ γὰρ δυνάμεθά τι κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀληθείας. 9. χαίρομεν[11] γὰρ[12] ὅταν [v]ἡμεῖς ἀσθενῶμεν, ὑμεῖς δὲ δυνατοὶ ἦτε· τοῦτο δὲ[13] καὶ εὐχόμεθα,

o Rev. ii. 2 iii. 10; Ps. xxv. 2.
p Reff. viii. 8.
q Reff. i. 13.
r Rom. i. 28; 1 Cor. ix. 27; 2 Tim. iii. 8; Tit. i. 16.
s Rom. ix. 3; 3 John 2.
t Reff. x. 18.
u Rom. vii. 21; Gal. vi. 9; 1 Thess. v. 21; Amos v. 14.
v Reff. xi. 29.

[1] DcEKL support **ζησομεθα**; G has **ζησωμεν**; better **ζησομεν** with ℵABD* 17.

[2] D* 17, d, e, g give **ζησ. εν αυτῳ** (a reading which may be the true one).

[3] G, g om. **εκ δυναμ. Θεου**; K om. **Θεου.**

[4] BDcE om. **εις υμας,** wherefore W.H. bracket the words.

[5] A om. **εαυτους δοκιμαζ.** [6] ℵ* om. **η.**

[7] BDEKL, d, e and the Syriac support the order **Ἰησ. Χρ.**; ℵAGP, f, g, vg. and the Bohairic give **Χρ. Ἰησ.**

[8] BD* 17 om. **εστιν** after **εν υμιν**; but it is found in all the remaining uncials and in the primary vss.

[9] DcEKL and the Peshitto support **ευχομαι**; better **ευχομεθα** with ℵABD*GP 17, 37, the Latin, Harclean and Bohairic vss.

[10] ℵKL have **ποιειτε** for **ποιητε.** [11] DEP, f give **χαιρωμεν.**

[12] DcE**K om. **γαρ**; the Peshitto has **δε.**

[13] ℵcDcEKL and the Peshitto give **δε και**; better om. **δε** with ℵ*ABD*GP, the Latin and Bohairic vss.

we can confidently submit to any testing of our apostolic authority.

Ver. 7. **εὐχόμεθα δὲ κ.τ.λ.**: *now we pray to God* (for **εὐχ. πρὸς** *cf.* Num. xi. 2) *that ye do no evil; not that we may appear approved, i.e.*, the motive of his prayer was not that his ministry should be accredited by its success, *but that ye may do that which is honourable* (see reff. and mark the contrast between **τὸ κακόν** and **τὸ καλόν**), *even though we be as reprobate.* That is, his prayer was for their sakes, and it was sincerely offered although, if it were fully answered, there would be no occasion for the exercise of his apostolic authority, and so the **δοκιμή** or "proof" which the malcontents were asking for (ver. 3) would not be manifested. And he gives two reasons for this disinterestedness of his intercessions for them: (i.) he could not exercise his authority, even if he would, except in conformity with the facts (ver. 8), and (ii.) their moral growth is a real joy to him (ver. 9).

Ver. 8. **οὐ γὰρ δυνάμ. κ.τ.λ.**: *for we can do nothing*, exhibit no Apostolic power, *against the truth, i.e.*, against the facts of the case, *but for the truth* (*cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 1 for the elliptical constr.). The principle here laid down is of far wider application than an accurate exegesis can assign to it in its context. It is a *general* principle, which Christian theology has not always sufficiently remembered, that to fight against truth, whether ethical or historical or scientific, is to fight against Him who is *the* Truth, and so is to court defeat. We *can* do nothing, even if we would, against the truth (*cf.* 1 Esdr. iv. 38).

Ver. 9. **χαίρομεν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**: *for we rejoice when we are weak and ye are strong, i.e.*, in Christian graces. The primary reference is to that weakness which the non-exercise of Apostolic authority would seem to suggest to them (ver. 4, xi. 21), and of which his opponents were very ready to accuse him (x. 10); but in *all* weakness of his he repeatedly declares his contentment, if it minister in any way to their edification (see iv. 12,

τὴν ὑμῶν [w]κατάρτισιν. 10. διὰ τοῦτο ταῦτα ἀπὼν γράφω, ἵνα παρὼν [1] μὴ [x]ἀποτόμως χρήσωμαι [2] κατὰ τὴν [y]ἐξουσίαν ἣν ἔδωκέ [3] μοι ὁ Κύριος εἰς [y]οἰκοδομὴν, καὶ οὐκ εἰς [y]καθαίρεσιν.

11. [z]Λοιπὸν, [z]ἀδελφοὶ, χαίρετε, [a]καταρτίζεσθε, παρακαλεῖσθε, [b]τὸ [4] αὐτὸ [b]φρονεῖτε, [c]εἰρηνεύετε· καὶ ὁ [d]Θεὸς τῆς ἀγάπης καὶ [5] [d]εἰρήνης ἔσται μεθ' ὑμῶν. 12. [e]Ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν [e]ἁγίῳ [6] [e]φιλήματι.

w Here only; *cf.* Eph. iv. 12; 1 Thess. iii. 10.
x Tit. i. 13 only; Wisd. v. 22 only.
y Reff. x. 8.
z Phil. iii. 1, iv. 8; 1 Thess. iv. 1.
a Rom. ix. 22; 1 Cor. i. 10; Gal. vi. 1; 1 Thess. iii. 10.
b Rom. xii. 16, xv. 5; Phil. ii. 2, iv. 2.
c Mark ix. 50; Rom. xii. 18; 1 Thess. v. 13.
d Rom. xv. 33.
e Rom. xvi. 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 20; 1 Thess. v. 27; *cf.* 1 Pet. v. 14.

[1] DEG and the Latins give **μη παρων.**

[2] DEGP have **χρησομαι.**

[3] KL and the Syriac support the order **εδ. μοι ο Κυρ.** (from x. 8); better **ο Κυρ. εδ. μοι** with ℵABDEGP, the Latin and Bohairic vss.

[4] A om. **το αυτο φρονειτε.**

[5] G 17, 73, g give **της ειρηνης** for **της αγ. και ειρ.**; DEL give **της ειρ. και της αγαπης.**

[6] AGL, f, g, vg. give **εν φιλημ. αγιω.**

xii. 10, and *cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 10).—**τοῦτο δὲ καὶ κ.τ.λ.**: *this we also pray for* (and not merely rejoice in), *viz.*, *your perfecting* (*cf.* ver. 11).

Ver. 10. **διὰ τοῦτο ταῦτα κ.τ.λ.**: *for this cause I write these things, i.e.*, this letter, *while absent that I may not when present* (*cf.* ii. 3) *deal sharply* (we must understand **ὑμῖν** after **χρήσωμαι,** as at Esth. i. 19, ix. 27) *according to the authority which the Lord gave me for building up and not for casting down.* The last clause is repeated *verbatim* from x. 8.

Conclusion.—Vv. 11-13. Final exhortations, salutations and benediction.—Ver. 11. **λοιπὸν, ἀδελφοὶ κ.τ.λ.**: *finally, brethren* (**λοιπόν** strictly = "from henceforth," but is used vaguely, as in reff. for "finally". "Well, then," is its nearest equivalent as used in Modern Greek) *rejoice* (as at Phil iii. 1, iv. 4, 1 Thess. v. 16 and everywhere in the Pauline Epp. where the word occurs; the rendering of the A.V. "farewell" cannot be justified. "Farewell" would be **ἔρρωσθε**), *be perfected* (see reff. and *cf.* Lightfoot on 1 Thess. iii. 10), *be comforted, be of the same mind, live in peace, and* then *the God of Love* (this phrase is only found here in N.T., but *cf.* 1 John iv. 8) *and Peace shall be with you.* In these exhortations we have a summary of the whole letter: (1) *Rejoice* in the grace you have received (i. 24, ii. 3) even as I do on your behalf (vii. 7, 9, 16, xiii. 9). (2) *Be perfected*, go on to perfection (vi. 1, 13, vii. 1, 11, ix. 8, xii. 19, xiii. 9), the word **καταρτίζεσθαι** being used as at Gal. vi. 1 of gradual amendment after a grave fault. (3) *Be comforted*, the keynote of the early part of the Epistle (see on i. 4 and *cf.* especially i. 4, 6, vii. 7). (4) *Be of the same mind, live in peace* (xii. 20). With the whole may be compared 1 Cor. i. 10, **παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς . . . ἵνα τὸ αὐτὸ λέγητε πάντες καὶ μὴ ᾖ ἐν ὑμῖν σχίσματα, ἦτε δὲ κατηρτισμένοι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νοῒ καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ.**

Ver. 12. **ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλ. κ.τ.λ.**: *salute one another with a holy kiss.* This common form of Eastern salutation became at an early date part of the ritual of Christian worship, as indicating the brotherhood of the faithful in the family of God. So early as Justin (*Apol.*, i., 65) we read of the "kiss of peace" in the service of the Eucharist.—**ἀσπάζ. ὑμ. κ.τ.λ.**: *all the saints, sc.*, all from Macedonia where the Apostle was, *salute you* (*cf.* Phil. iv. 22).

Ver. 13. **ἡ χάρις τοῦ κ. κ.τ.λ.**: *the Grace of the Lord Jesus Christ* (his concluding salutation in Rom., 1 Cor., Gal., Phil., Philm., 1 and 2 Thess.), *and the Love of God* (see on v. 14), *and the Fellowship of the Holy Spirit* (as at Phil. ii. 1, and *cf.* 1 Cor. i. 9, x. 16) *be with you all*, even with those who opposed him. The ordinary conclusion of a letter of the period was **ἔρρωσθε,** as **χαίρειν** was the introductory greeting (see on i. 1). But St. Paul has a signature of his own, which he calls the **σημεῖον ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ** (2 Thess. iii. 17); *viz.*, he always ends with a prayer that Christ's *grace* may rest on his correspondents, either in the form **ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρ. Ἰη. Χρ.** or in the abbreviated form **ἡ χάρις** (as in *Eph.*, *Col.* and the Pastorals). Here, and here only, he fills it out so

ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς οἱ [f]ἅγιοι πάντες. 13. Ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου[1] Ἰησοῦ f Reff. 1.
Χριστοῦ,[2] καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος
μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν. Ἀμήν.[3]

Πρὸς Κορινθίους δευτέρα ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Φιλίππων τῆς Μακεδονίας,
διὰ Τίτου καὶ Λουκᾶ.

[1] After **Κυριου**, some cursives, f, m, vg., the Peshitto and Bohairic add **ημων**.

[2] B om. **Χριστου**.

[3] ℵ[c]DEP, d, e, vg., the Syriac and Bohairic add **αμην**; better om. with ℵ*ABG 17, f, g, etc.

as to embrace the Three Persons of the Blessed Trinity. Possibly the phrase the "God of Love" in ver. 11 has suggested here mention of the "Love of God," *i.e.*, the love which God has for man; and a prayer for the "Fellowship of the Holy Spirit," *i.e.*, the **κοινωνία** which is the Spirit's gift, is a fitting conclusion to a letter addressed to a community agitated by faction and strife and jealousy (xii. 20). But whatever were the thoughts which suggested this triple benediction (*cf.* Num. vi. 23 f.), it remains, as Bengel says, "egregium de SS. Trinitate testimonium". It offers a devotional parallel to the Baptismal Formula (Matt. xxviii. 19); and the order of its clauses receives its explanation in later words of St. Paul: **δι' αὐτοῦ ἔχομεν τὴν προσαγωγὴν . . . ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα** (Eph. ii. 18). It is the Grace of Christ which leads us towards the Love of God, and the Love of God when realised through the Spirit's power promotes the love of man (1 John iv. 11), the holy fellowship fostered by the indwelling Spirit.

πρὸς Κορ. κ.τ.λ. This subscription is found (in substance) in KL, the Harclean and Bohairic vss. and in many cursives, but has no real authority. The mention of Titus and Luke is plainly derived from chap. viii. 18. A few cursives add the name of Barnabas; the Peshitto mentions Titus only. The form of subscription in the best MSS., ℵAB 17, is simply **πρὸς Κορινθίους β**.

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO THE

GALATIANS

INTRODUCTION.

Text. The text of this Epistle has been constructed with due regard to the traditional text (*Textus Receptus*) on which our Authorised Version was based. But the discovery of MSS. not then known, and the critical study of ancient authorities since that time, necessitate careful revision and extensive alteration of that text. For this purpose the editor has relied mainly on Tischendorf's collation of MSS. The *Apparatus Criticus* is based on his authority and follows his notation. It contains all the MS. evidence which appears really important for determination of the text. The following letters are used to designate uncial MSS.:—

ℵ	Sinaiticus.	F	Augiensis.
A	Alexandrinus.	G	Boernerianus.
B	Vaticanus.	H	Coislinianus.
C	Ephraemi.	K	Mosquensis.
D	Claromontanus.	L	Angelicus.
E	Sangermanensis.	P	Porfirianus.

Corrections of ancient date, inserted in the uncial MSS., are indicated by small letters or numerals (a, c, 1, 3) attached to the capital letters. Cursive MSS. are denoted by the numerals generally accepted for their designation.

The readings, punctuation, and division of paragraphs differ here and there from those adopted by Westcott and Hort. The reasons for these variations may be gathered from the notes.

Pauline Authorship. Widely different opinions are entertained by critics with regard to the date of the Epistle and the locality of the Galatian Churches. But its authorship has never been seriously questioned. This unanimity of tradition is probably due to the nature of its contents. For it is stamped throughout with characteristic features of the Pauline mind and spirit. Matter and style alike attest the personality of the Apostle to the Gentiles. It unites dialectic skill in criticising the language and history of the Old Testament,

and a comprehensive philosophy which assigns to law, to the spirit, and to the flesh their several functions in God's government of the world, with intense spirituality and absolute devotion to the Lord Jesus. The Apostle Paul alone of the Apostles and their contemporaries exhibited this rare combination of mental and spiritual qualities. None of his Epistles is more certainly genuine, none gives so vivid a picture of his mind and character during the most active stage of his apostolic career.

Ancient Testimony. The adoption of its language by Fathers of the Church in the second century proves its antiquity and high reputation in their time. Polycarp borrows ἥτις ἐστὶ μήτηρ πάντων ἡμῶν from iv. 26, and θεὸς οὐ μυκτηρίζεται from vi. 7; Irenæus gives a Latin version of iii. 19, referring to the Epistle by name; Justin Martyr reproduces Γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ, ὅτι κἀγὼ (ἤμην) ὡς ὑμεῖς from iv. 12, and ἔχθραι ἔρεις ζῆλος ἐριθεῖαι θῦμοι . . . καὶ τὰ ὅμοια τούτοις from v. 20. Its canonicity is established by its insertion in every Canon of Scripture. Marcion also placed it at the head of his catalogue of Pauline Epistles.

Antecedents of the Galatian Converts. Throughout the Epistle the author assumes the position of Founder, he addresses the Galatians as his own converts and claims special authority over them in the name of Christ who had made him Apostle and committed to him the ministry of the Gospel among them. One passage in the Epistle brings into prominence the diverse elements which entered into their composition, reminding us that, like other Pauline Churches, they were mixed bodies comprehending a minority of Jewish Christians (iii. 28). But the circumcised minority are in general ignored (iv. 8), for the Epistle is specially addressed to the Greek converts, who had not yet accepted circumcision, but had of late been urged by agitators to submit to it for the sake of the covenanted blessings attached to it at its institution. These uncircumcised Greeks formed apparently the mass of the Galatian Churches: there is at the same time no doubt that they had been for some time regular attendants on the teaching of the synagogue, for the Epistle assumes throughout their familiarity with the patriarchal history, the Law, the Psalms and Prophets, as well as expositions of Scriptural topics by Jewish teachers. They had belonged, in fact, to the body of devout Gentiles who frequented Jewish synagogues, studied Jewish Scriptures, and found many points of sympathy with their theology and morality, but repudiated their ceremonial law, and so formed a distinct class apart from the Jewish congregation.

Locality of the Galatian Churches. The locality of these Churches demands attentive consideration, for on the determination of this depends not only the date of the Epistle, but the whole of its historical connection with the life of Paul. The theory that these Churches were situated amidst the Keltic population in the north-east of Asia Minor, though it wraps much of their early history in darkness, requires us to assume that they were founded during the missionary journey of Paul and Silas across Asia Minor and revisited by Paul three years later: otherwise it could not be reconciled with the narrative of the Acts. The reaction therefore towards Judaism, which evoked the Epistle, cannot be dated before the commencement of his Ephesian ministry. Now before that time Paul had openly broken with the synagogue at Corinth and established Churches in Achaia practically independent of Judaism. Is it reasonable to conclude that a Pharisaic reaction in some of the Pauline Churches was then for the first time started with success and excited in his mind the lively apprehension which is here expressed? In my judgment the history of Greek Christianity precludes it, for a very real and formidable agitation on this very subject had once already run its course, and been so decisively checked in Syria and Palestine after the success of Paul and Barnabas in Southern Galatia as to render its renewal quite hopeless. A demand was made at Antioch by a Pharisaic party for the circumcision of all Christians, the authority of Paul and Barnabas was openly challenged, and the peace of the Church was endangered by conflicting views. But the decisive condemnation of this agitation at Jerusalem led to its speedy collapse; there is no trace, outside this Epistle, of its subsequent revival in any Greek Church. On the contrary the career of Paul within the next two or three years irrevocably established the independence of Greek Christianity; hence I conclude that the two intrigues of the Pharisaic party, first at Antioch, next in the Galatian Churches, recorded in this Epistle were but a later stage of the movement recorded in the Acts—last expiring efforts of Judaism to arrest the growing freedom of Greek converts.

But putting aside for the present the question of date, is there ground for supposing that these Churches were planted in the cities of Northern Galatia, Ancyra Pessinus and Tavium, as the late Bishop Lightfoot persistently contended, rather than in those of Southern Galatia, the Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe, as Professor Ramsay maintains? Great weight is deservedly attached to the opinion of Bishop Lightfoot; but it must be remembered that

it was formed more than a generation ago, when comparatively little was known of the internal geography of Asia Minor, or of its condition under the Cæsars: whereas Professor Ramsay's advocacy of the opposite view is founded on intimate acquaintance with the geography and history of the country during the first century. Again, Paul's foundation of the four southern Churches and subsequent visits to them are well-attested facts, while he is not known to have visited the northern division at all. It had indeed little attraction for an educated Greek as a sphere of missionary enterprise, and held out little promise of success, for it was then inhabited mainly by an imperfectly civilised population of Keltic herdsmen and shepherds. If the authenticity of the Acts be admitted, the earliest occasion on which Paul was within reach of Northern Galatia, and can have founded Churches there, was on his way to Troas and Macedonia. It has accordingly been suggested that he may then have turned aside to preach amidst that people. But every stage of that journey was accomplished under the immediate guidance of the Spirit, and the silence of the narrative, written as it was by a fellow-Christian who accompanied the apostolic party from Troas onwards, is conclusive against that theory. That history leaves the reader virtually no choice but to identify the Galatian Churches with the four whose foundation it records. It is futile to object that the instability which the Epistle reproves in the Galatians was characteristic of a Keltic people, for it belonged as certainly to the populace of the southern cities, or that there *may* have been Jews and Greeks in the northern cities when history establishes the special preponderance of these elements in the southern. The further contention that the name Galatia was not extended to the southern division of the province save in official language ignores the fact that the province had been seventy-five years in existence and really furnished the only collective name for the heterogeneous races incorporated in it under the previous rule of Galatian kings. If it be urged again that Paul would not have designated his Churches by the name of the province, the answer is that throughout his Epistles he invariably groups his Churches according to provinces, whether Syria or Asia, Macedonia or Achaia. His reference in this Epistle to the Churches of Judæa and to his ministry in Cilicia can hardly be reckoned an exception, for these were quasi-provinces governed independently by imperial procurators. Nor was this practice a mere accident of language: it faithfully reflected his deliberate policy of Church extension, suggested perhaps by the example of the Jewish Dispersion, who had before

planted their synagogues in the principal centres of commerce and civilisation. It was certainly his practice to establish groups of Churches round the several capitals of provinces, and link those centres together by chains of Churches along the main roads, and so to create an ecclesiastical organisation closely corresponding to the existing divisions of the Empire. We find for instance that he made the provincial capitals Antioch, Corinth and Ephesus successive centres of Church life as they were of imperial administration, and surrounded each with its group of dependent Churches. But for Jewish malice he might have done the same for Thessalonica; and his eager aspiration to visit Rome reveals still wider projects for multiplying these federations of Churches until they became coextensive with the Empire.

Hence I conclude that in this Epistle also the name Galatia denotes the province, as it clearly does in 1 Peter i. 1, and that the Galatian Churches were those in its southern portion whose foundation is recorded in the Acts. This conclusion is confirmed by the leading part assigned to the Galatian Churches in the collection for the Saints (1 Cor. xvi. 1). It is further supported by the previous course of Galatian history.

Galatian History. The Greek name Galatia denoted originally, like the Roman Gallia, the country of the Gauls or Kelts (Γαλάται). About B.C. 278 a considerable detachment of warriors, roughly estimated at 20,000, broke off from three of the Keltic tribes that poured down on Greece, and made their way across into Asia Minor with wives and children. As war was their trade and only means of subsistence, they scoured the country far and wide, sometimes plundering on their own account, sometimes allying themselves with various kings and cities, or taking service under them as mercenary soldiers. Eventually they formed permanent encampments under native chieftains in the north-east of Phrygia, south of Bithynia and Pontus, speaking their own language and dwelling apart from the older Phrygian inhabitants. This district became consequently known as Galatia: its broad stretches of upland afforded pasture for their flocks and herds, and their families found safe homes in their cantonments. But the limits of their territory were still unsettled, depending continually on the fortune of war: for the tribesmen retained their predatory habits and were hardly ever at peace with all their neighbours. At last, however, in B.C. 189 they were forced by a crushing defeat which they encountered at the hands of the Romans to respect the peace of their neighbours, and began to cultivate home industries within their own

borders. Gradually they mingled more freely than at first with the Phrygian population, adopted their religion, though they retained their own language, and dwelt among them as a dominant race, so that Northern Galatia became the home of a settled people.

But a century later the Mithridatic wars swept to and fro across their country, obliterating the old landmarks and opening a new chapter in Galatian history. Many of their chieftains distinguished themselves on the Roman side, and were rewarded with large grants of territory outside the old borders: one in particular, Deiotarus, became by the favour of Pompey the most powerful monarch in Asia Minor. He and his successors were enabled by the active part which they took in the ensuing civil wars of Rome, or by judicious desertion of the losing cause, to enlarge and consolidate their kingdom until it embraced Southern Phrygia with parts of Lycaonia and Pisidia, and extended to the range of Taurus. This was the kingdom which the last native ruler Amyntas bequeathed to the Romans at his death in B.C. 25. A Roman province was formed out of it, and retained the name Galatia which had belonged to it under its Galatian king. There is nothing in this history of gradual expansion to justify the arbitrary restriction of the name to the northern division alone.

Still less reasonable does this appear in the light of its subsequent history. For seventy-five years before this Epistle was written Galatia had formed a single province of the Empire. Now the unity of an imperial province was not merely official, but affected all the relations of life. A system of centralised despotism prevailed under the Cæsars which concentrated all authority—military, civil, judicial alike—in the hands of the governor; commercial and financial matters were regulated by him; his court was the centre of social life. The name Galatia therefore in the N.T. can only mean the great central province of Asia Minor which bore that name.

But in the middle of the first century there was a wide difference in language, occupation, nationality, social organisation, between the northern and southern portions of the province. The northern was still mainly Keltic and pastoral with comparatively little commerce and few roads. Southern Galatia, on the contrary, was full of flourishing cities, and enriched by the constant flow of commerce across it. This was the natural result of its geographical position and political history. In ancient times it formed the highway along which the Asiatic monarchs of the interior maintained their communication with the western coast. When Greek monarchs ruled in Syria and Asia Minor, the high-road between their two capitals

Antioch and Ephesus passed through it and it became a principal channel for the flow of Greek commerce and civilisation eastwards. They were careful accordingly to plant and foster colonies of Greeks and Jews along the line of route. Hence came the mingled population of Greeks and Jews amidst whom Paul found so congenial a soil for planting Christian Churches. Augustus Cæsar in due time inherited the policy of the Syrian monarchs together with their dominions in Asia, planting fresh colonies in that region in order to secure the important high-road to the east for his legions and for the interchange of commerce. The citizens of these various colonies and municipalities had but one collective name—the name of the imperial province to which they belonged. So also the Galatian Christians, though for the most part of Greek or Jewish origin (as the tenor of previous history suggests), could hardly be addressed by any other name than that of Galatians.

Joint Mission of Paul and Barnabas. Throughout the early history of Greek Christianity no more important event is recorded than the conversion of Southern Galatia. The area of Christendom had not till then been extended beyond Syria, Roman Cilicia, and the island of Cyprus. The successful ministry of Paul and Barnabas in Galatia added a new province to the kingdom of Christ, drove a wedge deep into the heart of an idolatrous region, and established a valuable outpost for further advance into Asiatic and European Greece. And the special character impressed by the circumstances of that ministry upon the new Churches gave additional importance to their foundation beyond the material extension which it effected in the area of Christendom. There for the first time Paul made a direct appeal to his Gentile hearers against Jewish opposition, and met with an enthusiastic response. These Churches started in consequence with an overwhelming majority of Gentile converts. In them for the first time the Jewish Christians, who had hitherto held an undisputed initiative in the Church, found themselves in a decisive minority. This altered relation of Greeks and Jews produced a crisis in the history of Greek Christianity, and in the apostolic career of Paul himself. For the Greeks had previously occupied a subordinate position in the Church, and the Apostle to the Gentiles had played a secondary part in the ministry of the Gospel. When, however, he boldly denounced the Jewish people and their rulers in the Galatian synagogue for the murder of Christ, proclaimed him the light of the Gentiles, and overruled the claims of the Law in favour of purely spiritual doctrines of divine forgiveness and grace, of human faith and repentance, the Greeks recognised in Jesus the

Saviour of the whole world rather than the promised Messiah of the Hebrews, and rallied round the Apostle as the foremost champion of Greek freedom in Christ. It was the commencement of a veritable revolution. Hitherto Christianity had been regarded for the most part as a national religion, it was now perceived to be a world-wide revelation, and an irreconcilable antagonist to the narrow formal creed of the Jewish synagogue. Gentiles had indeed been admitted to the Church many years before, when Peter baptised Cornelius and his friends; and the assembled Church had then solemnly ratified his act. The right of believing Gentiles to Christian baptism had thenceforth become a fundamental law of the Church, sealed to them in perpetuity by a divine charter which none could gainsay. But the acceptance of this principle had wrought little visible effect upon the structure or government of the Church. No sudden influx of Gentile converts flooded the existing Churches; they only grew insensibly by continual adhesion of individual Gentiles or groups of Gentiles to older congregations of Jewish Christians. The process of conversion was too silent and gradual to exercise material influence over the prevailing spirit of the community or to remodel its ministry and organisation. Christian teachers retained in those early years the stamp of their Jewish training, partly because the Hebrew Scriptures continued to be the only written Canon of faith and practice (though they had learned to interpret them in a new spirit), but still more because the Apostles and older disciples had grown up to manhood before they had known Jesus, had accepted the Law for their rule of life, and drawn their inspiration from the writings of Hebrew prophets; they prided themselves on their descent from Abraham and the patriarchs, rested on God's ancient covenants with Israel, and fixed their hopes on the future kingdom of the national Messiah, which had a deeper significance for them than for other Jews because their faith was concentrated on the person of a living Lord who had risen from the dead and ascended into heaven. Again, the outward environment of the Church was no less Jewish than the spirit of its teaching, for the synagogue was still the only centre of public ministry open to Christian teachers. Thither the brethren resorted regularly for reading of the Scriptures, for united prayer and praise, and for religious instruction; there they delivered addresses to mixed congregations of Jews and Christians, basing their doctrine on the Jewish Canon. They claimed, in fact, to be a reformed branch of the ancient national Church, and were long regarded by the Greek world as a purely Jewish sect.

Accordingly, the conversion of the Gentiles made at first but slow progress; few came within touch of the Christian ministry but those who had already become regular attendants on the worship of the synagogue, the devout Gentiles who clustered round Jewish congregations in Greek cities. These were not proselytes, for they shrank from circumcision with all the ceremonial bondage and social exclusiveness which it entailed; but they had become familiar with the language, the history and the spirit of the Old Testament, and had accepted much of its theology and morality. They were predisposed by these antecedents to listen gladly to a Gospel which placed the love of God and man above ritual observance and taught the brotherhood of all mankind: and so embraced the faith in considerable numbers. But these Greeks had no rights whatever in the Jewish congregation; though their attendance was tolerated, if not encouraged, they were only admitted on sufferance. They were therefore at first content, after having occupied so subordinate a position in the synagogue, to fill a secondary place in the Church, and to acquiesce willingly in the leadership of Jewish Christians.

These considerations account for the tardy growth of Gentile Christianity, which lingered for several years on the eastern coast of the Levant without an attempt to raise its voice in the Greek cities to the west.[1] Even in Antioch, afterwards the mother-city of Greek Christianity, the Greeks were slow to vindicate their independence of Judaism. The prompt response however of that Church to the call of the Spirit for special labourers in the Lord's vineyard attested at last the growing strength of their spiritual life and their hopeful confidence in the future of the Kingdom. The diffusion of the faith had up to that time been due more to providential circumstances than to spontaneous effort; refugees had been driven by persecution to seek safety in distant cities, and had carried their faith with them in their flight. But the mission of Barnabas and Saul was a purely missionary enterprise despatched for the express purpose of extending the Gospel to the islands and coasts of the Mediterranean. The two Apostles were necessarily invested with wide discretion in regard to the conduct of their mission;

[1] Thirteen years elapsed between the conversion of Saul and the Apostolic Council. The baptism of Cornelius took place before Christian refugees from Jerusalem had settled in Cæsarea or Philip had taken up his abode there; so that it coincided more or less closely with the beginning of this period, whereas the mission of Paul and Barnabas belongs to its latter years; for the special object of the Apostolic Council was to allay the heart-burnings aroused among Jewish Christians by its success, and to restore the peace of the Church.

neither their route nor their methods could be fully determined in advance, for they depended on future openings that might present themselves, and were therefore in large measure left to their own judgment. But the direction in which it was launched gives a clear intimation of the desires and hopes that animated its authors; it turned its back on Palestine and the East, and set its face toward Asiatic Greece and the famous centres of Greek civilisation; it was, in short, a message from a Greek Church to their Greek brethren in other lands.

The condition of Western Asia at that time held out an exceptional promise of success to Christian Apostles. Thanks to the universal peace and settled order which the Cæsars had established throughout the Empire, that region had attained a high pitch of industrial activity and commercial prosperity. In spite of the social corruption and luxurious vices which riches brought in their train, the consequent exuberance of life, social, intellectual and spiritual, afforded a favourable opening for religious reform. The region had been in former centuries a frequent battlefield between Greek and Asiatic races, and still formed a border-land between eastern and western thought. But the religion which the people had inherited from ancient times was more Oriental than Greek, and its degraded type of sensuous worship could hardly satisfy the conscience even of a heathen community to which the influences of western civilisation had penetrated. Greek philosophy and Roman morality combined to create a nobler ideal of human duty and divine government than could be reconciled with the popular religion, so that all the better feelings of educated men and women were stirred into revolt against the debased superstition of the masses.

The religious ferment produced by this collision was specially aggravated by the multiplication of Jewish colonies in the principal cities of Asia Minor, systematically planted and fostered long ago through the wise policy of Syrian kings for the encouragement of trade and promotion of intercourse between these two races of their subjects. These settlements were particularly thriving in Southern Galatia, along the direct line of communication between the two capitals Antioch and Ephesus. Nowhere else are recorded such conspicuous traces of their religious influence over the surrounding population. They formed, of course, distinct communities of their own, divided from the Greeks by unsociable habits as well as ritual obligations and religious scruples. Yet their Scriptural teaching proved so attractive to seekers after God that a considerable number of Greeks frequented their weekly services in the Pisidian

Antioch and in Iconium, and these, like the devout Gentiles everywhere, were disposed to give a cordial welcome to the preaching of Christ. Accordingly, it was in those cities that His Apostles gained their first conspicuous success; there Asia Minor first awoke to the call of the Gospel, and the first fruits were reaped of an abundant harvest. It was, perhaps, inevitable that this hearty reception of the new doctrine by Greeks should provoke intense jealousy on the part of the Jews, and arouse bitter opposition from them. The vehement appeal of Paul to his Gentile hearers at Antioch brought that opposition to a head, and stirred the passions of both parties to fever heat. The Jews heard the impotence of their law for salvation denounced in their own synagogue, the Gentiles heard the offer of a new way of salvation by repentance and faith in Christ alone.

From that hour both alike recognised in that Apostle the foremost champion of Gentile rights and the most formidable adversary of Judaism.

Let us now, therefore, turn to his personal history and review the chain of circumstances which landed him with his colleague in the interior of Asia Minor. The record of the joint mission during its first few months was uneventful; they traversed Cyprus from end to end, preaching in all the synagogues by the way without achieving any success that the historian counted worthy of record. Barnabas, himself a native of the island, naturally took the lead in virtue of his older standing in the Church and of his superior position at Antioch as the chosen representative of the Twelve, but failed apparently to elicit any enthusiastic response. It was not till they reached Paphos, the western port and the seat of the Roman government, that the spirit of Paul was stirred within him to carry his appeal to Gentile hearers. He procured by some means an audience of the proconsul, and after a signal manifestation of his spiritual power in smiting Elymas with blindness, succeeded in converting Sergius Paulus himself. This success was fruitful in results: it established Paul's virtual leadership; for Barnabas, though he retained the nominal dignity of head, was content to submit the further guidance of their policy to the more determined counsels of his energetic colleague.[1] A new spirit of enterprise speedily mani-

[1] The historian chooses this occasion for dropping the Hebrew name Saul and adopting the Greek name Paul, indicating that he then entered on his special ministry to the Greeks. In relating the voyage from Paphos he ignores Barnabas altogether, and in the subsequent narrative assigns him throughout a secondary part. The language of the Lycaonian populace furnishes an apt illustration of

fested itself in their proceedings. *Paul and his Company* (as they are designated in Acts xiii. 13), crossing to the mainland, struck at once across Pamphylia and the Pisidian highlands into the interior. The desertion of John Mark at this critical moment is significant. He was warmly attached to his cousin Barnabas, and had undertaken the office of minister to the Apostles; yet so reluctant was he to embark with them on their new enterprise that he did not hesitate to incur a well-grounded charge of disloyalty by withdrawing from the mission immediately on touching the coast of Pamphylia, and leaving them to pursue their way without him to the Pisidian Antioch. This faint-hearted desertion serves by way of contrast to bring out in stronger relief the resolution with which the Apostles pressed forward from the coast. But on their arrival in Galatia their journey was arrested and came to an apparently premature termination. For many months they settled down permanently—first in Antioch, then in Iconium—with an absolute determination not to depart until they were either expelled by authority or driven to flight by imminent peril of life. Even then they did but take refuge in neighbouring cities for a while until the storm had passed, and eventually revisited the scenes of their former ministry, and so retraced their steps to the coast from which they had started, after firmly planting the faith of Christ in the region of Southern Galatia. The narrative does not explain this sudden arrest of the onward movement which had carried them with such determined energy into the interior, it simply records the fact that they stopped short in Antioch, without any intimation that a change had occurred in the apostolic policy. The reader might well gather from it the impression that Galatia had been all along their destined sphere of labour. This, however, could hardly be: it can scarcely be conceived that they contemplated the cities of Galatia as their final objective when they started with such resolute purpose from Paphos; for those cities had neither ancient fame nor present importance to attract special attention. Nor, again, would Mark have found that brief expedition into the interior so alarming as to desert his post if he had known how short a distance they were about to travel. What then, were the subsequent circumstances that prompted Paul and Barnabas to abandon their more ambitious designs and take up their residence at Antioch? The history and character of Paul quite

their mutual relations to each other: they recognised the superior dignity of Barnabas by identifying him with Jupiter, but called Paul Mercury because he was the chief speaker.

forbid any suspicion that the change was owing to caprice or to irresolution on his part. Nor was it due to the immediate and unexpected success of their ministry in that city; on the contrary, his recorded address in their synagogue furnishes ample evidence of his previous failure to touch the consciences or win the hearts of his Jewish hearers. He, doubtless, had begun his ministry there, as elsewhere, by offering the Gospel to the Jews, and his bitter denunciation of their prejudice against Christ shows how stubborn had been their resistance to his Gospel before he turned to his Gentile hearers with this despairing appeal.

On the whole therefore I conclude from a survey of the historical narrative that Paul and Barnabas embarked at Paphos on an ambitious project of missionary enterprise, which for some unknown reason they failed to realise, though they pursued it steadily without a pause as far as Antioch. It further appears that their first efforts after their arrival in that city were foiled by the persistent opposition of the Jews, but that their perseverance was at last rewarded by signal success amongst the Greeks.

It is time now to turn to the Epistle and compare these conclusions with the incidental reference there made to the circumstances of the conversion. In Gal. iv. 13 the Apostle reminds his converts that he had not originally preached the Gospel to them by his own deliberate choice, but on account of an illness which deprived him of all option in the matter. They knew (he writes) that his preaching had been due to infirmity of the flesh, *i.e.*, to bodily illness. This language plainly intimates that he altered his plans in consequence of the illness, and undertook their conversion instead of carrying out his previous intention. Neither the time nor the place of the attack are specified, but the context supplies materials for determining both. It shows that the Galatians were quite aware of his previous design, that they had been eye-witnesses of the illness, had watched its progress and seen enough of its repulsive symptoms to provoke natural contempt and disgust, but had on the contrary exhibited heartfelt sympathy and intense desire to alleviate his sufferings. It is quite certain therefore that it ran its course *after* his arrival in their country. It may have been contracted on the way; if it was (as his language in iv. 15 and vi. 11 suggests) an attack of virulent ophthalmia which permanently impaired his sight, it is probable that he caught the infection in the lowlands of Pamphylia, where that malady was notoriously prevalent. But whatever its specific character, it was in Galatia that it prostrated him, and by incapacitating him for continuing his journey

left him no choice but to prolong his stay in the country, and so occasioned the conversion of the Galatians as its eventual result. Evidently the illness beset him so soon after his arrival that he had no time before the attack either to resume his journey or to entertain any plan for preaching where he was. It was, however, so tedious and protracted in its operation that it altered his whole scheme of travel. And whereas he was but a passing stranger when he broke down, and had not attempted to make a single convert, he found himself before its close surrounded by a devoted band of friends who were zealous to make any sacrifice for his relief. The pathetic language of the Epistle shows how intimate an affection had grown up between the Apostle and his Galatian hosts, and makes it clear that the nucleus of a future Church was formed by the ministrations of his sick chamber. No mention is made of this illness in the Acts, for it belonged to the personal history of the Apostle rather than to the history of the Church; but the record dovetails with subtle harmony into the narrative of the Acts, explaining at once why he stopped short at the first stage of his intended journey, and how it came to pass that so many of his hearers afterwards rallied round him with enthusiasm on his appearance in the synagogue of Antioch.

A consideration of the geographical condition of Asia Minor in the middle of the first century brings out still more clearly the thorough agreement of the two narratives. The Epistle implies, as we have seen, that the foundation of the Galatian Churches was due to an interrupted transit through their country. Now this conception is fatal to the idea of a northern site for those Churches. What possible object could the Apostle have for visiting Northern Galatia at all unless it was for the conversion of its people? It lay quite away from his recorded track, and it is inconceivable that he intended to traverse it on his way to some still more distant field of labour. Southern Galatia, on the contrary, was traversed from end to end by a great highway along which he is known to have travelled four times, visiting the cities through which it passed. According to the Acts the first of these cities visited by the Apostle was the Pisidian Antioch in the extreme south of the Galatian province. There his journey was for some reason arrested, and there he succeeded after a prolonged sojourn in founding the first Galatian Church. These facts identify Antioch as the scene of his involuntary detention, and its position gives at once a definite clue to the original purpose of the apostolic expedition from Paphos. It was a Roman colony planted by Augustus Cæsar on the main road which

ran from Syria to the western coast of Asia and so linked the eastern provinces of the Empire with Greece and Rome by way of Ephesus. It was besides in direct communication with the southern coast of Pamphylia, and so with Cyprus; for a system of military roads, studded with colonies, converged upon it from the south. For full half the year this was the only regular means of communication between Paphos and the province of Asia; for even in autumn the persistency and violence of the Etesian winds out of the Ægean Sea made it difficult and dangerous for the best found vessels to round the Cnidian promontory, as was proved by Paul's subsequent experience. There is also good reason to calculate that Paul and Barnabas, starting from Syria after the reopening of navigation in the spring, spent the summer in traversing Cyprus from end to end and did not arrive at Paphos before the autumn. Their only means of proceeding westward at that season was to cross to the mainland in such coasting craft as they could find at Paphos and strike across Pamphylia to the main road at Antioch, as they did. This raises a presumption that their original object in making so eagerly for the Pisidian Antioch was to reach Ephesus and the province of Asia. On arriving at that city they had the option of three routes only: (1) to proceed northward by local roads into the heart of Phrygia, which was obviously not their intention when they started from Paphos; (2) to move eastward to Iconium and other Galatian cities, but these are expressly excluded from his original purpose by the language of the Epistle in iv. 13; (3) to pursue their journey westward by the high-road to Ephesus. This was Paul's project on his next visit to the Galatian Churches, and was doubtless his design on this occasion, had it not been hindered by illness, as it was afterwards by the voice of the Spirit. It was, in fact, ordained that the conversion of the Galatians should form the first step to that of Asia Minor, and that Ephesus and the famous cities of the western seaboard should be reserved for the final consummation of his apostolic labours amid the Asiatic Greeks. The outcome of his public ministry with Barnabas in Southern Galatia is recorded in Acts xiii., xiv. His successful appeal to the conscience of his Greek hearers provoked intense jealousy on the part of the unconverted Jews, who proceeded to hunt the Apostles with determined malice from every city in succession. They were enabled with the support of influential partisans at Antioch, by secret plots at Iconium, and by mob-violence at Lystra, to put the Apostles everywhere to flight, but not before they had planted in each place the seed of a future Church, which had become so firmly established before the final departure of Paul and Barnabas

from the country that they were able to organise a permanent framework for the government of the several Churches. According to their own report of their mission, its most conspicuous feature had been the door of faith which God had opened to the Gentiles. The widespread alarm raised in the Churches of the Circumcision by the number and ritual independence of these Greek converts produced a crisis in the Church and threatened a dangerous schism between its Jewish and Greek sections. Christians from Judæa raised a standard of open revolt against Paul and Barnabas at Antioch, disputing their right to concede this freedom to the Gentiles. Thanks, however, to the intervention of the older Apostles these agitators were decisively condemned at Jerusalem, the apostolic authority of Paul and Barnabas was triumphantly vindicated, and the liberty of Gentile converts in the matter of circumcision was finally established, while the religious prejudices of Jewish Christians against communion with the unclean were mitigated by prudent concession to Jewish sentiment.

Second Ministry of Paul in Galatia. The apostolic conference at Jerusalem was followed by a gathering at the Syrian Antioch of Christians from Jerusalem. Besides Judas and Silas, who were deputed by the Church of Jerusalem to proceed to Antioch as their representatives, Peter himself repaired thither with Mark and others, whose influence so seriously undermined that of Paul in the mind of Barnabas that they agreed to separate. Paul accordingly enlisted Silas as his companion for a fresh mission to the cities of the Greeks. His first object was to revisit his Galatian converts and communicate to them the terms of union between Jewish and Gentile converts which had been ratified by the Churches at Jerusalem and Antioch. He hastened apparently to carry tidings of that decision in person, probably crossing the mountain-passes from Cilicia as early as they were open in the ensuing spring,[1] and to recommend its observance to his disciples. During this visit he also made choice of Timothy for his minister, and decided in consequence to circumcise him, lest the Jews should take offence in the cities he was about to visit. His visit was otherwise uneventful. He traversed the whole country, confirming the Churches everywhere, but only on his way to the new sphere which lay before him; and did not revisit Galatia till three years later on his way from Syria to Ephesus.

Motive and General Scheme of the Epistle. The opening

[1] It appears from Cicero's letters that at the time of his government of Cilicia these passes were absolutely closed during the winter months (*Cic. ad Att.*, v., 21), even for important despatches.

verses of the Epistle throw a clear light on the motive which prompted it. In i. 1 he vindicates his own apostolic commission, in i. 6-9 the truth of his Gospel, against an attack which was troubling the peace of the Galatian Churches in his absence. The movement was not spontaneous, but due to an intrigue set on foot by foreign emissaries. Alarming tidings had, however, reached the Apostle as to the progress of the agitation. Its nature becomes apparent from the whole tenor of the Epistle; it was an attempt of the Pharisaic party to revive Judaism within the Church. For this purpose it was necessary for its authors to impugn the truth of the Apostle's doctrine, and they sought accordingly to undermine his personal influence and depreciate his apostolic authority. Some had even ventured to impeach the sincerity and the consistency of his teaching by accusing him of an inordinate desire to please (i. 10). He had perhaps given specious occasion for this charge by his avowed principle of becoming all things to all men, but he dismisses it lightly with scorn, for the friends and converts to whom he was writing knew well that his real motive had always been to win men to Christ. He does not apparently feel it needful to defend his motives, but concentrates attention on two points, the truth of his Gospel, and the reality of his commission from God. He begins with an indignant denunciation of the new heresy, which he declares to be a spurious perversion of the one true Gospel. But he perceives the necessity for vindicating his own right to speak in the name of Christ before grappling with the main issue and developing the fundamental divergence of the Gospel in its essential basis and spirit from the Law. For the result of the conflict depended practically more on the personal than the doctrinal factor. He had been himself the foremost champion of Gentile freedom in Christ; the doctrine of free grace in Him had won its way mainly through the advocacy of Paul and owed its triumph in Galatia, at Antioch, and in Jerusalem, to his eloquent support. This was why his antagonists had endeavoured to depreciate his position in the Church, and to set up the Twelve as the real interpreters of Christ on earth, that they might thereby discredit his authority as a teacher. The circumstances of his life furnished opponents with plausible ground for questioning the soundness of his doctrine. He had neither listened to the voice, nor seen the face, of Christ on earth; he had not attended on His ministry like the Twelve, nor been sent forth like them by His express command. He was, in short, to use his own words, an Apostle born out of due time. This made it easy for them to contend that he had not received

the Gospel by direct revelation from Christ, but gathered it at second-hand from the Twelve. To meet this insidious policy, he was forced to place on record the true history of his conversion and subsequent ministry in Christ. He relates accordingly God's revelation to him of His Son from heaven, his secret communion with God apart from all human intercourse, his entire independence of the Twelve, the full recognition of his Apostleship to the Gentiles by the three pillars of the Church at Jerusalem, and his public rebuke to Peter at Antioch. Incidentally this autobiography is of the utmost historical value: while it is in perfect harmony with the outlines of the historical narrative, it adds to it a rich store of personal details, and reveals the inward motives and policy of the chief actors in successive scenes. It relates, however, only certain events which bore on the immediate object of the author, *viz.*, the vindication of his own position in the Church.

The remainder of the Epistle (with the exception of a few personal appeals and practical exhortations) is devoted to a scrutiny of the divergent principles of the Law and the Gospel. The intruders, belonging manifestly to the Pharisaic party, had been urging the Greek converts in Galatia to embrace circumcision, not as an absolute necessity for salvation, but as a counsel of perfection which would invest them with superior holiness to their uncircumcised brethren, would entitle them to a higher place in the Kingdom of God, and secure to them the covenanted blessings promised to the children of Abraham. By this arrogant pretension to superiority in the sight of God these Jewish Christians were in fact pouring dishonour on baptismal grace, reopening the quarrel between Jews and Gentiles and destroying the unity of Christ. The Apostle combats this delusive persuasion by setting forth the true function of the Law in the divine economy. It had proved in practice impotent to bless, for it stipulated for a perfect obedience to which flesh could not attain as a condition precedent to acceptance before God, so that Israelites had in fact fled to Christ for refuge from the curse of a broken law: it was *primâ facie* inconsistent with the unconditional promise of God to Abraham, and the Mosaic dispensation was really an exceptional provision against the lusts of the flesh, designed like the preparatory discipline of childhood to last only during years of immaturity before the advent of the true Seed of Abraham. He argues that the Law was a bondage imposed on the children of Abraham after the flesh, whereas Christians are the true seed of Abraham and heirs like Isaac of God's ancient promises. By union with Christ in His death they have died to the condemna-

tion of the Law, by union with His life they have become partakers of His Spirit. They are therefore freed in Christ from the dominion of the Law unless they wilfully submit themselves to its yoke afresh by embracing circumcision. For the spirit within them stedfastly resists every sinful lust of the flesh, and brings forth of itself good fruit abundantly.

Summary of Contents. The principal heads of the argument are as follows:—

i. 1-5. Address, blessing, ascription of glory to God.
i. 6-9. Rapid defection of the Galatians from their faith; denunciation of spurious Gospels.
i. 10-ii. 14. Repudiation of corrupt motives; attestation of the author's apostolic commission and of his independence of the Twelve and of human teaching; his championship of Gentile rights; and the recognition of his ministry to the Gentiles by the acknowledged pillars of the Church.
ii. 15-21. Israelites had themselves confessed by seeking salvation in Christ through faith that no flesh can attain to the righteousness of the Law. Paul himself had died to Law with Christ that he might be quickened with Him to the new life of Christ within him.
iii. 1-14. Spiritual blindness of the Galatians. Was it faith or obedience to Law that had procured for them the gifts of the Spirit? By faith men become children of Abraham and inherit his blessing. The Law entails a curse and not a blessing, but Christ has redeemed us all from the curse of the Law by bearing it Himself.
iii. 15-iv. 7. The publication of the Law from Sinai could not annul or modify God's earlier covenant with Abraham. It was merely a preparatory discipline like that of childhood and a temporary provision against the lusts of the flesh, ordained for children of the flesh till the world was ripe for the Advent of Christ the true seed. All that are His are one with Him, and so are the seed of promise: they have outgrown the restraints of spiritua childhood and regained their birthright of freedom in the House of God.
iv. 8-10. Protest against the revival of ignorant superstitions.
iv. 11-20. Appeal to the remembrance of former affection.
iv. 21-30. Illustration out of patriarchal history of the mutual relations between Jews and Christians.
iv. 31-v. 12. Assertion of Christian freedom; protest against renewed bondage by circumcision; threats of punishment against these devotees to the flesh.
v. 13-vi. 10. Warning against the abuse of freedom; antagonism of the spirit to the flesh; its perfect harmony with Christ's law of love and excellence of its fruits; practical exhortation.
vi. 11-18. Peroration, and farewell blessing.

Comparison of Galatians ii. 1-10 with Acts xv. 1-29. In Gal. ii. 1-10 is recorded a conference of Paul and Barnabas with the Church of Jerusalem and its members. It appears from the narrative that they went up to Jerusalem for the express purpose of vindicating their right in virtue of their office as ministers of

Christ to exempt Gentile converts from circumcision—a right which had been seriously disputed, but strenuously maintained by them. It further appears that James, Peter and John welcomed them as brethren in Christ, and fully recognised their special commission from God to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles. In Acts xv. 1-29 is likewise recorded an open revolt at Antioch against the authority assumed by Paul and Barnabas to exempt Gentile converts from circumcision. They were forced in consequence to undertake mission to Jerusalem for the vindication of Gentile freedom in Christ as well as their own apostolic authority, and to enter upon prolonged debates with the Apostles and elders there gathered. In the sequel the Church resolved, on the advice of Peter and James, to repudiate unreservedly the claim for universal circumcision in the Greek Churches, to condemn the agitators, and heartily to commend the services of Barnabas and Paul to the cause of the Gospel. The two records differ in details—it could not well be otherwise if they are really independent—but agree completely about the substantial facts. The same issue is raised in both, *viz.*, the right of Paul and Barnabas to dispense with the obligation of circumcision, the same Apostles take part in the conference. It is true that the presence of John is not noted in the Acts, but the speakers only are there named, and John probably did not speak, but stood silently beside Peter as in earlier days, while Peter spoke for both; the result of the proceedings is the same according to both records. Now, this result was of such vital importance that it decided for all time the relation of Christianity to Judaism, declaring it to be world-wide in its scope, and distinguishing it from the national creed of the Jewish people. As the sanction given by the Circumcision to Peter's baptism of Cornelius had before stamped their approval on the admission of the uncircumcised to baptism beyond recall, so the Apostolic Council decided finally the union of all the members of Christ in a single Church: the concession once made at Jerusalem in the name of the assembled brethren was final.

There were, in fact, but two occasions on which Paul and Barnabas went up together from Antioch to Jerusalem, and the object of both visits is specified. The earlier occurred in the lifetime of Herod Agrippa, and, therefore, not later than 44, before their successful mission to Cyprus and Asia Minor, whereas the Epistle records the recognition of their special ministry to the uncircumcision in the fourteenth year after the conversion of Saul. Again, it was undertaken merely to carry alms with a view to an impending famine, and they found the Church of Jerusalem on their arrival in

the utmost peril. Herod was hunting down its leaders for death, and they were seeking safety in concealment or flight. Neither they nor Saul could show their faces without imminent danger, much less assemble to discuss the claims of the uncircumcised. The envoys could only depart in haste after depositing their alms in the hands of the elders. On the contrary, the account given in the Acts of their later visit to Jerusalem corresponds entirely (as we have seen) with the apostolic narrative. The historian, of course, reviews the event from the standpoint of Church history, while the Apostle presents the incidents in their personal aspect, and the details vary accordingly in the two narratives. For instance, the Epistle does not state that Paul and Barnabas were deputed by the Church of Antioch to represent them at Jerusalem, though we might well gather this from the circumstances and the history of their reception; it does, on the other hand, record a revelation of the spirit, either to him or to the Church, which prompted the action of both, though for some reason unrecorded in the pages of the history. The statement of Paul, that he took with him a Greek disciple of his own, incidentally confirms the statement of the Acts that other Christians were deputed to accompany the Apostles. The account given in the Acts of a personal collision between the Apostles and certain agitators at Antioch, on the subject of circumcision, explains the reference made in the Epistle to a demand for the circumcision of Titus, which Paul had steadfastly resisted. Whatever semblance has been found of divergence in the two accounts is really due to misconception of the language. Many critics have argued, for instance, as if the struggle over Titus took place at Jerusalem, but a careful student of the Greek text may perceive that it really occurred at Antioch before the mission, and is in perfect harmony with Acts xv. 1, 2. Again, James, Peter and John have been represented as at first lukewarm and hesitating in their support of Paul and Barnabas; but the Greek text places their brotherly cordiality in strong contrast with the prejudices and coldness of other Christians who had once been of high repute in the Church.

The silence of the Epistle about the injunctions of the Council to abstain from ceremonial uncleanness is easily understood. They were indispensable for harmonious intercourse between Greeks and Jews in one communion; they were of real value until the Church was able to promulgate a new law of uncleanness based on true principles and distinguishing real from ceremonial pollution. Paul had therefore recommended their observance, and had, partly in

consequence of this deference to the Mosaic law, been charged with preaching circumcision (v. 11). But the two questions were really distinct, and he is careful in this Epistle to confine himself to the subject of circumcision.

Historical Connection of the Epistle with the Life of Paul. The Galatian Epistle belongs obviously to the same group as the Thessalonian, Corinthian and Roman, but critics are by no means agreed as to its position amidst them in point of time, some placing it before, some between, some after, the others. All were written during the seven years in which Paul was engaged in founding and organising successive Churches on both sides of the Ægean Sea, there was considerable uniformity in the circumstances of his life throughout this period of apostolic activity, and this uniformity is reflected in a certain family likeness which runs through all the Epistles of that date. All except the Roman sprang out of the needs of infant Churches beneath his care. These depended largely on his personal example and authority for guidance in faith and morals; accordingly the personal element looms large in all, in none more so than in this. He was throughout in continual contact with Jewish influences, utilising the synagogue everywhere while it was possible for the conversion of devout Gentiles as well as Jews, and everywhere encountering opposition and persecution from the Jews. There was, however, little occasion to combat Judaism in the Thessalonian Epistles, for that Church was at the time suffering grievously from Jewish persecution; in the Corinthian Church again the Greek element predominated, and the most pressing dangers arose from the contamination of heathen license and idolatry. Therefore the antagonism between Pharisaic Judaism and Christianity comes into prominence in the Galatian and Roman Epistles alone. Both employ almost identical language in contrasting the Law and the Gospel, the former based entirely on the holiness of God and man's duty of absolute obedience, the latter adding the revelation of God's love even for sinners, and His offers of forgiveness and grace to all that believe in Christ. But the coincidence is not due to any similarity in the circumstances of the two communities. In the Galatian Church the Apostle was combating a survival of Judaism amidst his own converts, in the Roman Church he was laying down principles for a community who had hitherto had no Apostolic guidance. Still less can the identity of language be fairly urged to prove an approximation in the date of the two Epistles. For these fundamental truths formed without doubt the staple of the Apostle's teaching throughout the years of continuous transition

from Jewish to Christian doctrine, and his language in regard to them could not fail to become in some measure stereotyped.

We tread on far safer ground when we rely on historical considerations for determining the occasion of the Epistle. During the seven years of continuous transition from Jewish to Christian doctrine a radical alteration was effected in the position of Greek Christianity and of Paul himself. At the beginning no Greek Churches existed outside Syria except those which he and Barnabas had founded: the two stood on the same level, and rival teachers had fair show of reason for ranking him below the Twelve; at its close a multitude of Churches in Europe and Asia recognised him as the great Apostle to the Gentiles, and he might have replied to his detractors with scorn by pointing to the visible tokens of divine blessing stamped on his apostolic labours in Macedonia, Achaia, and Asia. That he did not do so in his Galatian Epistle furnishes conclusive proof of its early date. When Paul, after his second visit to Galatia, departed for an indefinite time to an unknown destination in the west, there was still a reasonable chance of inducing many Galatian converts to submit to circumcision in his absence, but with every fresh Greek Church added to the communion the hope must have steadily faded. The growing strength, number, and independence of these Churches soon after made a revival of Judaism in one of them hopeless. But the attempt made at Antioch after the Council (as the Epistle records) to affix a stigma of uncleanness on the uncircumcised shows that the Pharisaic party, though defeated in their efforts to *enforce* circumcision on all members of Christ, had not then abandoned the hope of *persuading* their Greek brethren to adopt it, and had little scruple about putting unfair pressure upon them for this object by withdrawing from their communion. Their partial success at Antioch in obtaining the adhesion of Peter and Barnabas to their practice encouraged them to hope much from fresh efforts in the absence of Paul. The moment was otherwise favourable for a renewed attempt to advocate circumcision in the Galatian Churches. Jewish influence was strong in the country; the people were impulsive and excitable, easily swept to and fro by capricious currents of religious emotion; the vacillation of Peter and Barnabas had made it easy to claim their sanction and set up the authority of the Twelve against that of Paul. He had himself during his recent visit furnished his adversaries with a fresh handle for misrepresentation, for he had circumcised Timothy and had recommended his converts to abstain from the forms of ceremonial uncleanness most offensive to the Jews, so that he was even said to be now preaching

circumcision (v. 11). The imputation seems absurd in view of his later life, and would have been so after he had openly broken with the synagogue, but was plausible enough when he was bent above all things on promoting harmony between the two sections of the Church by some voluntary sacrifices of Greek freedom in Christ. I contend therefore that the recent warnings to which i. 9 refers (see notes on that verse) were delivered on the occasion of his second visit to Galatia after the Apostolic Council, that the agitation in the Galatian Churches was a sequel of the intrigue at Antioch, some of the Pharisaic emissaries having probably followed the receding steps of the Apostle that they might renew their insidious schemes behind his back, and that the Epistle followed speedily on this agitation. Its language certainly implies a close connection between the two movements; for the remonstrance spoken at Antioch passes insensibly into the written argument without any clear line of division. If a later date be assigned to the Epistle, the abrupt termination of the autobiography on the eve of the second visit becomes unintelligible. The earlier date explains also the motive which prompted him to record his personal collision with Peter. It is inconceivable that he raked up this story out of a distant past. But if the example and authority of Peter and Barnabas had been employed by his rivals in Galatia to undermine his position, it became necessary for him in his own defence to give a true version of the events that had occurred at Antioch.

Assuming therefore that the reactionary movement in Galatia followed closely on his departure, where and when was the Epistle written? It may be presumed that he lost no time after he was informed of it before writing to counteract it; but the tidings could not reach him without considerable delay, for his destination was unknown until he himself opened communications from Philippi. Probably therefore he could receive no news from Galatia till after his arrival at Thessalonica; there was not however very frequent intercourse then between that city and Galatia, and his stay there was cut very short by persecution. The absence of Silas and Timothy at the time of writing points distinctly to the early days of his ministry at Corinth, for they were with him in Macedonia, but did not rejoin him afterwards till some weeks after his arrival in Corinth. That they were absent is morally certain. Their names, which appear conspicuously in the Epistles to the Thessalonians written about the same time, are here absent in spite of Timothy's Galatian home, and in i. 9 the writer expressly refers to the united warnings delivered by him and his colleagues Silas and Timothy, to fortify

the appeal which he now makes in his own name (*as* we *have forewarned you of late*, I *say again*). This date explains also the absence of any greeting from a Christian Church by name, for at the time the Apostle had only begun to gather round him the nucleus of the future Church of Corinth in the house of Aquila and Priscilla. I conclude therefore that the Epistle was written from Corinth before the arrival of Silas and Timothy, in which case it is the earliest Epistle of Paul now extant, being written before the Epistles to the Thessalonians. The previous outrage at Philippi and the subsequent persecutions which he encountered in Macedonia make the references to persecution and to the marks of Jesus branded on his body peculiarly appropriate.

Result of the Epistle and Subsequent History of the Churches. The Pharisaic reaction came upon Paul as an unwelcome surprise after the enthusiastic reception they had originally given to the doctrine of free grace in Christ, and the recent confirmation of their faith by personal intercourse. He gives vent, accordingly, in forcible language to his indignation at the disloyal intrusion of false teachers into his own fold. Their readiness to listen with itching ears to strange doctrines, and to be fascinated by the charms of religious novelty, even though the doctrine was incompatible with the spirit and the cross of Christ, and in spite of attacks aimed at the position of their own well-proved Apostle, distressed him sorely for they argued unsoundness in their faith, and shook his confidence in the permanence of their loyalty to Christ. But ought we, therefore, to conclude that they were permanently estranged from their great Apostle? Are we to infer the depth and strength of the reaction from its suddenness? It seems to me that the balance of evidence in the Epistle inclines the other way and tends to suggest their substantial loyalty in spite of some temporary estrangement. For the agitation is declared to be but *a little leaven*, dangerous in principle and fraught with possibilities of evil, but only just beginning to work; no mention is made of Greek converts having actually adopted circumcision. Paul expresses his confidence that they will all be of one mind with him; he does not hesitate to threaten the intruders with the judgment of the Churches if they persist (v. 10); he longs indeed to come amongst them and assure himself by a fresh visit of their fidelity to Christ and His Apostles, but he lays down his pen with an assurance that henceforth no man will trouble him. And the evidence of history confirms this favourable impression; it would seem that the Epistle did really succeed in re-establishing the faith of the Galatians. For we hear no more of any anxiety about

their state; the Apostle was in no hurry to make his voice heard among them—he let three years pass before he revisited them, and then only on his way to Ephesus. Yet an incidental reference in 1 Cor. xvi. 1 attests his confidence in their unshaken loyalty. It appears from that passage that when he appealed to all his Greek Churches for a joint contribution for the poor brethren in Jerusalem, the Galatians were the very first to receive his instructions, even before the Corinthians. It is a slight but sufficient testimony to the unbroken strength of the tie that bound them to their own Apostle.

ΠΡΟΣ ΓΑΛΑΤΑΣ.[1]

I. 1. ΠΑΥΛΟΣ ἀπόστολος, (οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων, οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν

[1] ℵABDEFGK 17, etc.

CHAPTER I.—VV. 1-5. APOSTOLIC ADDRESS, BENEDICTION AND DOXOLOGY.—The Epistle opens with the author's name and the designation of his office, *Paul, an Apostle.* So far it follows the regular practice of Apostolic Epistles in advancing at the outset a claim to attentive hearing. But circumstances gave in this case a special significance to this opening; for in the Galatian Churches rival agitators had seriously challenged the author's right to this title of Apostle, so that the bare mention of his office involved a distinct protest against the slanders which had been circulated in regard to his office and his person. He proceeds, accordingly, to an emphatic vindication of his divine commission, *not from men, neither through man.* He raises here a twofold issue, evidently corresponding to two specific points in his qualifications for the office, which his adversaries had on their side selected for attack. The transition from the plural in the first clause, to the singular in the second, is significant, and helps to furnish a key to the two particular points in his career on which his enemies had fastened. His mission to the Gentiles had apparently been disparaged on the plea that it had emanated *from men, i.e.*, from the Church of Antioch only. Again, the validity of his commission was impugned on the ground that he had originally received the Spirit *through a man, i.e.*, through the agency of Ananias, who had been deputed to lay his hands upon him at Damascus. By these insinuations an invidious comparison was instituted between Paul and the original Apostles who had been sent forth by Christ Himself, and had received the Spirit by a miraculous outpouring from Heaven on the day of Pentecost. It was obviously impossible to confute these aspersions by alleging any specific act of the risen Lord. Accordingly Paul contents himself for the moment with an indignant repudiation of the calumnies, reserving his full vindication for the historical review of his conversion and Christian life (i. 10-ii. 14). The tokens by which the risen Lord had attested His presence and His commission to His servant Paul had been very real and certain to the eye of faith; but they had, from the nature of the case, been less tangible than the evidence of His living voice and presence during His earthly sojourn; they had been granted at successive stages of the Apostle's life, and had often taken the shape of visions, personal revelations, and spiritual communion. At his conversion he had been declared a chosen vessel for future ministry; three years later the Lord had replied to his prayer in the temple, bidding him depart from Jerusalem, *for* (He said) *I will send thee far hence unto the Gentiles;* afterwards, at Antioch, the Spirit had given command, *Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them;*

ἐκ νεκρῶν,) 2. καὶ οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοὶ, ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας· 3. χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ Κυρίου ἡμῶν[1] Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 4. τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν περὶ[2] τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν

[1] ημων BDEFGKL; placed after πατρος ℵAP 17.
[2] περι ℵADEFGKLP; υπερ B 17, 67.

thereupon God had visibly sealed his appointment by the abundant blessing bestowed upon his labours, as the Galatians themselves could amply testify.—**διὰ . . . πατρὸς.** The previous combination of **ἀπό** and **διά** in the negative clauses invites a corresponding combination here in the antithesis, **ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς,** declaring, on the one hand, the instrumentality of the Son in the appointment of His Apostle, and, on the other, tracing back the authority with which he was invested to God the Father as its original source. But Paul prefers here, instead of contemplating his apostleship to the Gentiles by itself as a single act of the Divine Head of the Church, to connect it with the larger design of building up the Church of Christ, for which the united action of the Father and the Son was indispensable. The Father set that design in motion by raising Him from the dead, and is here accordingly associated with the Son as directly co-operating in the government of the Church. In the subsequent review of his own personal life, Paul in like manner perceives the immediate hand of God in his pre-Christian life, setting him apart from his mother's womb, and training him under the law for his future work as an Apostle, before he was brought to Christ at all.

Ver. 2. **οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ.** No name is mentioned: neither Timothy nor Silas, nor any other companion of Paul known to the Galatians can have been with him when he wrote, nor is the name mentioned of any Christian congregation; probably he was residing in some Greek city in which no Church had yet been formed. The phrase **οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ** seems, from its use in Phil. iv. 21, to describe a small group of brethren immediately surrounding the Apostle; for the salutation from them is there followed by a separate salutation from the Roman Church in general. The position of the Apostle during his first few weeks at Corinth, before Silas and Timothy rejoined him, corresponds closely to the circumstances indicated by this phrase (see Introd., pp. 146-147).—**ἐκκλησίαις.** There were four Churches in Southern Galatia, but they formed a single group, being all bound together by the great imperial highway that ran through them, and gave facility for constant intercourse. All would, therefore, respond speedily to any religious impulse, like the wave of Pharisaic reaction which the Apostle is combating in this Epistle.

Ver. 3. The apostolic blessing is here as elsewhere summed up in the comprehensive words *grace and peace*. These include the lifegiving power of the spirit as well as the assurance of God's forgiving love in Christ and peace with an accusing conscience. This verse affirms once more the co-operation of the Father with the Son in devising and carrying out the scheme of man's redemption.

Ver. 4. **περὶ τ. ἁμαρτιῶν.** The sin offerings of the Law were designated **περὶ ἁμαρτίας** (*cf.* Heb. x. 6, 8), but **περί** and **ὑπέρ** were equally applicable with reference to Christ's offering of Himself for our sins; the former fixing attention on the effect of His sacrifice in doing away sin, the latter on the motive which prompted Him, *viz.*, love for sinners. The two prepositions are combined in 1 Pet. iii. 18. It is often difficult to decide which is the genuine reading owing to the variation of MSS.: but here they are greatly in favour of **περί,** which is also more appropriate to the context: for in this clause a comparison is intended between the sin-offerings of Christ and the typical sin-offerings of the Law; while the next expresses the motive of the Saviour by the addition **ὅπως ἐξέληται . . .—αἰῶνος.** In early Greek this word denoted the appointed lifetime of man, and so combined the thought of an overruling destiny with the course of human life. From the conception of individual life was developed that of corporate life, whether of families, nations or societies, and the idea of divine appointment was more distinctly fastened on the word in Scripture, so that every successive dispensation of God was designated as an **αἰών.** In this place **αἰῶνος** denotes the world which Jesus found existing at the time of His coming, out of which He chose His disciples.

ἡμῶν, ὅπως ἐξέληται ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος αἰῶνος[1] πονηροῦ, 5. κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν, ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

6. Θαυμάζω ὅτι οὕτω ταχέως μετατίθεσθε ἀπὸ τοῦ καλέσαντος

[1] αιωνος τ. εν. ℵAB 17, 39; τ. εν. αι. ℵ$^{corr.}$DEFGHKLP.

World is the nearest English equivalent to **αἰών** in this sense, if only it be understood to mean a particular phase of human society, as in the phrases *religious world*, *scientific world*, etc., and not the material universe.—**ἐνεστῶτος**: *existing*. This participle is twice elsewhere applied to things existing by way of contrast to things future (**μέλλοντα**), in Rom. viii. 38 and 1 Cor. iii. 22. A similar contrast is here suggested between **ὁ ἐνεστώς** and **ὁ μέλλων αἰών**, *i.e.*, between the world which Christ found existing on earth and the Messianic world whose coming Hebrew prophets had foretold.—**πονηροῦ**. This sweeping condemnation of the existing world corresponds to the language of the Baptist and to Christ's own denunciations of the evil generation to which He came. In spite of all that revelation and conscience had done to leaven it, He found the faithful few in number, and evil predominant in the mass.—**ἐξέληται**. Here, as in Acts xxvi. 17, this verb coupled with **ἐκ** can only denote *choice out of* the world, not *deliverance from* it, which would require the addition of **ἐκ χειρός**, as in Acts xii. 11, or some equivalent. The clause describes the process of selection begun by Christ on earth, and still continued by the risen Christ as He calls fresh disciples into His Church continually.

Ver. 5. **ᾧ ἡ δόξα**, *sc.* **ἐστιν**. Our versions supply **ἔστω** and turn the clause accordingly into an invocation of praise. But the insertion of the article points rather to an affirmation, *whose is the glory*. The verb is usually omitted in the doxology, but **ἐστιν** is added in 1 Pet. iv. 11. *The glory* consists in the manifestation of the Father's character throughout all the ages in the continual redemption of mankind according to His will. Hereby is revealed His union of perfect wisdom, holiness, and love.—**εἰς τ. αἰῶνας τ. αἰώνων**. **αἰών** denotes in Scripture a divinely appointed period (see note on ver. 4). The larger of these divine dispensations comprehend within them other shorter periods, and are therefore designated **αἰῶνες αἰώνων**. The phrase in the text ascribes the glory to God for the whole term of these dispensations, *i.e.*, for all the ages of human life, since these together make up the sum of man's existence. The full form is used by the Apostle in Phil. iv. 20, 2 Tim. iv. 18, but he uses elsewhere the shorter form **εἰς τ. αἰῶνας**.—**ἀμήν**. This *Amen* crowns the previous declaration of the glory of God by an invitation to the Churches to join in the ascription of praise.

Vv. 6-9. THE APOSTLE EXPRESSES SURPRISE AT THE SUDDEN DEFECTION OF HIS CONVERTS FROM THE ONLY TRUE GOSPEL, AND PRONOUNCES ANATHEMAS ON ALL PERVERTERS OF THE TRUTH.—Paul is evidently startled at the tidings of a sudden revolution in Galatian feeling. His intense indignation is evinced by the vehemence of his language and the solemnity of his anathema. There could be but one true Gospel; this new doctrine was no Gospel at all, but only a heretical perversion of the truth by foreign agitators. They were probably emissaries of a Pharisaic party in the Church, which advocated circumcision and legal observances for all converts alike.

Ver. 6. **μετατίθεσθε**: *ye are removing* (not *removed* as in A.V.). The agitators had not yet achieved any decisive success, though the Galatians were disposed to lend too ready an ear to their suggestions. It was not so much their actual progress, as the evidence afforded of the instability of the Galatian faith, that excited misgivings in the mind of Paul (*cf.* iv. 11, 20); he regarded the movement as merely *a little leaven*, and had not lost his confidence in the personal loyalty of his converts and the general soundness of their faith (v. 9, 10, vi. 17. See Introd., p. 147).—**τοῦ καλέσαντος**, *sc.* **Θεοῦ**. The Gospel call proceeded from God, like those to Abraham and the ancient servants and people of God; the Epistles of Paul invariably attribute it to Him (*cf.* i. 15), not to His human instruments.—**ἐν χάριτι**. This is evidently not = **εἰς τὴν χάριν** (*into the grace of Christ*, A.V.), but records the spirit of Divine love which prompted the call. God, of His grace in Christ, sent forth the Gospel to the Galatians by the hands of Paul

ὑμᾶς ἐν χάριτι Χριστοῦ εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον· 7. ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο, εἰ μή τινές εἰσιν οἱ ταράσσοντες ὑμᾶς, καὶ θέλοντες μεταστρέψαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. 8. ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐὰν ἡμεῖς ἢ ἄγγελος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ εὐαγγελίσηται ὑμῖν παρ' ὃ εὐηγγελισάμεθα ὑμῖν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. 9. ὡς προειρήκαμεν καὶ ἄρτι, πάλιν λέγω, Εἴ τις ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελίζεται παρ' ὃ παρελάβετε, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

and Barnabas.—**ἕτερον.** This passage brings out forcibly the different meaning of **ἕτερος** and **ἄλλος**. **ἕτερος** is primarily *the other* of two, **ἄλλος** *another* of several. Hence **ἕτερος** fixes attention on two objects exclusively (*cf.* note on **τὸν ἕτερον** in vi. 4); here it marks the essential difference between the true and the spurious Gospel, distinguishing the latter as quite *a different Gospel*.

Ver. 7. **ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο.** The translation of this clause in A.V. and R.V. (*which is not another*) has caused great embarrassment by its apparent identification of the spurious Gospel with the true. Lightfoot pleads ingeniously that **ἄλλο** may mean another besides the true Gospel, and so interprets the clause to mean that it is no Gospel at all; but this will hardly be accepted by most other scholars. The American revisers suggest the rendering *which is nothing else than*. But these difficulties arise from making **ὅ** the subject of the sentence: surely it is in fact a connecting adverb (*touching which, as to which, whereas*), as it is again in ii. 10, and probably in ii. 20. If the clause be rendered, *whereas there is no other Gospel* (*i.e.*, than the true), the sense becomes perfectly clear, and it forms an appropriate introduction to the succeeding anathemas by its emphatic testimony to the one true Gospel.—**εἰ μή . . .** This clause qualifies the former "there is no other Gospel," only a spurious semblance (on the use of **εἰ μή** see note on ver. 19). —**τινές.** There is a studied vagueness in this and other references to the agitators. They were evidently not Galatian Christians, but strangers from abroad, whom the Apostle treats with real or affected contempt.

Ver. 8. **ἡμεῖς.** Paul here associates with himself the colleagues Barnabas, Silas, Timothy, who had combined with him to preach the Gospel. He desires to impress on his disciples that the controversy is not between one teacher and another, but between truth and falsehood: no minister of Christ, not even an angel, can alter the truth in Christ.—**ἀνάθεμα.** The two derivatives, **ἀνάθημα** and **ἀνάθεμα**, are both employed in the LXX and N.T. in different senses. **ἀνάθημα** serves, as in other Greek authors, to denote a temple offering, statue, or ornament (*cf.* 2 Macc. ix. 16, Luke xxi. 5), while **ἀνάθεμα** is restricted to the Hebrew conception of an offering devoted under a solemn vow to death or destruction (Lev. xxvii. 28, Josh. vii. 1, Acts xxiii. 14). The Epistles of Paul attach to the word the idea of *spiritual* death. The significant addition **ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ** in Rom. ix. 3 associates with it the further idea of separation from Christ, and consequent loss of all Christian blessings and means of grace. It does not, like excommunication, pronounce a judicial sentence on particular convicted offenders, but solemnly affirms general laws of the spiritual kingdom, *e.g.*, in 1 Cor. xvi. 22, any *who love not the Lord*, here any who tamper with the truth of the Gospel, are pronounced outcasts from the faith, and dead to the Spirit of Christ.

Ver. 9. **προειρήκαμεν.** The contrast between this plural and the singular **λέγω** proves that Paul is here referring, not to previous warnings of his own by letter, but to joint warnings given by his companions Silas and Timothy as well as himself during his visit to the Churches. He never speaks of himself in the plural number. **ὡς . . . ἄρτι**: *as we have also forewarned you of late, I say again*. Our versions interpret **προειρήκαμεν** *we have said before* and **καὶ ἄρτι πάλιν λέγω** *so say I now again*. But Greek usage forbids this antithesis between **προ.** and **ἄρτι. Προλέγειν** means *to forewarn*, not *to say in time past* (*cf.* 2 Cor. xiii. 2, Gal. v. 21, 1 Thess. iii. 4); while **ἄρτι** is used indifferently of recent or of present time. In Matt. ix. 18, 1 Thess. iii. 6 it means *of late*, in Matt. xxvi. 53, John xiii. 7, 37, xvi. 12, 31, 1 Cor. xiii. 12, xvi. 7 it means *now*, by way of contrast with the future. **Ἄρτι** cannot therefore be used to contrast the present time with the immediate past. The words **καὶ ἄρτι** belong really to the preceding clause, and contain a reminder how recent had been the warnings which the Apostle is repeating. Since the rendering of John ix. 25 *Whereas I was blind, now*

10. Ἄρτι γὰρ ἀνθρώπους πείθω ἢ τὸν Θεόν; ἢ ζητῶ ἀνθρώποις ἀρέσκειν; εἰ ἔτι[1] ἀνθρώποις ἤρεσκον, Χριστοῦ δοῦλος οὐκ ἂν ἤμην. 11. Γνωρίζω δὲ[2] ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι κατὰ ἄνθρωπον· 12. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγὼ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου παρέλαβον αὐτό, οὔτε[3] ἐδιδάχθην, ἀλλὰ δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. 13. Ἠκούσατε γὰρ τὴν ἐμὴν ἀναστροφήν ποτε ἐν τῷ

[1] ει ετι ℵABD¹FG 17, etc.; ει γαρ ετι D³EKLP.
[2] δε ℵAD³EKLP; γαρ ℵ*BD¹FG 17.
[3] ουτε before εδιδ. BD³EKL; ουδε ℵAD¹FGP 31, etc.

I see appears to contradict this view of ἄρτι, it may be well to point out that ὤν does not mean *whereas I was*, but that the speaker's real meaning was, *I being* (*sc.*, by nature) *blind now see*.

The true rendering is of some historical importance, as evidence that warnings on the subject of circumcision had been given to the Galatians by Paul and his companions during a recent visit (see Introd., p. 146).

Vv. 10-24. Repudiation of corrupt motives. Evidence from Paul's personal history that his conversion was due to God, and that he was taught the Gospel by God independently of the Twelve and of Jerusalem.—Ver. 10. The order of words in the Greek text forbids the stress laid in our versions on the alternative *men or God;* the meaning of which is besides a little obscure in this connection. The true rendering of ἤ is *rather than* (= μᾶλλον ἤ), as in Matt. xviii. 8, Luke xv. 7, xvii. 2, 1 Cor. xiv. 19: *Am I now persuading men rather than God?* This language indicates clearly what kind of calumnies had been circulated. His detractors accused him of sacrificing the truth of God for the sake of persuading men. It was, we know, his boast that he *became all things to all men*, but whereas his real motive was that he might win all to Christ, they insinuated that he was more bent on winning favour with men than on securing the approval of God. During his recent visit he had made two concessions to Jewish feeling; he had circumcised Timothy, and had recommended for adoption regulations tending to promote harmonious intercourse between Jewish and Gentile converts. It was easy to misrepresent these concessions as an abandonment of his former principles: and they furnished his enemies accordingly with a handle for decrying him as a time-server without fixed principles, now bent on winning Jewish favour, as he had been before on gaining the Gentiles (see Introd., p. 145, and *cf.* v. 11).—Ἄρτι. The Greek text throws the emphasis on this word, and its subtle irony is brought out by the ἔτι which follows. "Am I doing this *now?* Do you charge me *now* (he says in effect to these partisans of Judaism) with regarding men more than God? There *was* a time, before I knew Christ, when I did study to please men: if that were still my desire, I should not have been a servant of Christ."

Ver. 11. γνωρίζω. Here, as in 1 Cor. xii. 3, xv. 1, this verb has the force of *reminding* rather than of *making known*. In all three passages the author calls attention to forgotten truths, which had once been well known.

Ver. 12. ἐγὼ. The personal pronoun is inserted, because the author is here laying stress on the special education he had received for his ministry of the Gospel. He had not learnt it, like his converts, from human teaching, but by direct communion with God in spirit, as the Twelve had learnt it from Christ's own teaching. This independence of older Christians is a marked feature in the history of his life. The agency of Ananias was necessary for his admission into the Church, but after his baptism no older Christian appears on the scene at Damascus.

Ver. 13. Ἠκούσατε. The Galatians had no doubt heard from Paul himself of his former persecution of the Church. How frequently it formed the topic of his addresses to Jewish hearers may be gathered from his defence of himself at Jerusalem in Acts xxii., and before Agrippa in Acts xxvi.—Ἰουδαϊσμῷ. The rendering of this word in our versions, *Jewish religion*, is unfortunate: it implies a definite separation between the two religions which did not then exist, for Christians were still habitual worshippers in the synagogue; and it puts

Ἰουδαϊσμῷ, ὅτι καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἐδίωκον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἐπόρθουν αὐτήν· 14. καὶ προέκοπτον ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ ὑπὲρ πολλοὺς συνηλικιώτας ἐν τῷ γένει μου, περισσοτέρως ζηλωτὴς ὑπάρχων τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων. 15. ὅτε δὲ εὐδόκησεν ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου, καὶ καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, 16. ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ, ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, εὐθέως οὐ προσανεθέμην σαρκὶ καὶ

this view into the mouth of Paul, who steadfastly persisted in identifying the faith of Christ with the national religion. The word **Ἰουδαΐζειν** denotes the adoption of Jewish habits, language, or policy (*cf.* ii. 14). So here **Ἰουδαϊσμός** denotes Jewish partisanship, and accurately describes the bitter party spirit which prompted Saul to take the lead in the martyrdom of Stephen and the persecution of the Church. Incidentally the partisanship was based on a false view of religion, for the narrow intolerance of the Scribes and Pharisees was a prevailing curse of Jewish society at the time; but **Ἰουδαϊσμός** expresses the party spirit, not the religion. Still more alien to the spirit of Paul is the language attributed to him in the next verse, *I profited in the Jews' religion* (A.V.): for it indicates satisfaction at the success of his Jewish career, whereas he never ceased to regard it with lifelong remorse. His real assertion here is that he advanced beyond his fellows in sectarian prejudice and persecuting zeal—a statement borne out by the history of the persecution.—**ποτε.** This adverb is obviously attached to the preceding substantive **ἀναστροφήν.**

The imperfects **ἐδίωκον . . .** describe the course of action continuously pursued by Saul down to his conversion.—**ἐπόρθουν.** This term is likewise applied in Acts ix. 21 to the havoc wrought by Saul in the Church.

Ver. 14. **συνηλικιώτας.** Saul had been educated at Jerusalem, and this word points to his contemporaries in the schools of the Pharisees.—**γένει.** This term sometimes denotes *family*, but here *race and nation*, as in Acts xviii. 2, 24. So also **συγγενής** in Rom. ix. 3, xvi. 7, 21.—**ζηλωτὴς.** This is not here the proper name of a sect, being coupled with a genitive, as in Acts xxi. 20. Saul had no sympathy with the anarchical sect of Zealots who preached the sacred duty of revolt from Rome, though he had the persecuting zeal of an orthodox Pharisee. —**πατρικῶν.** This differs in sense from **πατρῷος.** The latter denotes the national law and customs of Israel (Acts xxii. 3, xxviii. 17), the former the hereditary traditions of the family, as the addition of **μου** further signifies. In Acts xxiii. 6 Paul describes himself as a son of Pharisees.

Ver. 15. **ἀφορίσας.** Paul looks back on his parentage and early years as a providential preparation for his future ministry: this view is justified by his antecedents. By birth at once a Hebrew, a Greek and Roman citizen, educated in the Hebrew Scriptures and in Greek learning, he combined in his own person the most essential requisites for an Apostle to the Gentiles. He was further moulded by the spiritual discipline of an intense, though mistaken, zeal for the Law of his God, which issued in bitter remorse. By this career he was fitted to become a chosen vessel to bear the name of Christ before the Gentile world. He did not hesitate accordingly to regard himself, like Hebrew prophets of old (Is. xlix. 1, 5, Jer. i. 5), as dedicated from his birth to the service of God.

Ver. 16. **ἀποκαλύψαι . . . ἐν ἐμοὶ.** These words taken alone might denote either an inward revelation to Paul himself, or a revelation through him to the Gentiles. But the context is decisive in favour of the former: for this revelation is not only associated closely with his conversion and his personal history between that and the visit to Arabia, but it is expressly stated that it was granted with a view to future preaching (**ἵνα . . .**).

The context distinguishes this revelation from the call; it cannot therefore be identified with the previous vision of Christ on the way, but (as the words **ἐν ἐμοί** import) was an inward and spiritual revelation which followed that appeal to eye and ear. The history corroborates this view: for it relates that Saul, after his vision, spent three days in solitary communion with himself and God before he was admitted to Christian baptism. — **προσανεθέμην.** This compound verb denotes (as in ii. 6) *additional* communication. After direct revelation

αἵματι, 17. οὐδὲ ἀνῆλθον εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα πρὸς τοὺς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἀποστόλους, ἀλλ' ἀπῆλθον εἰς Ἀραβίαν, καὶ πάλιν ὑπέστρεψα εἰς Δαμασκόν. 18. Ἔπειτα μετὰ τρία ἔτη[1] ἀνῆλθον εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἱστορῆσαι

[1] τρια ετη ℵAP 17, etc.; ετη τρια BDEFGKL.

from God Saul had no occasion to seek further advice from man. There is an apparent reminiscence in thought and language of Christ's words, *flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father.*

Ver. 17. **ἀνῆλθον.** The religious position of Jerusalem as seat of the Temple and mother-city of the Church, its political importance, and its geographical position on the central heights of Palestine, combined to suggest the application of the terms *up* and *down* to journeys to and from Jerusalem.—**ἀποστόλους.** In the third Gospel and early chapters of the Acts this title is habitually applied to the Twelve. It was extended to Paul and Barnabas on the occasion of their mission. In 1 Cor. ix. 2 Paul and Barnabas are distinctly enumerated amidst the recognised Apostles. Rom. xvi. 7 suggests a further extension of the title, probably to all founders of churches. But with the *possible* exception of James, no addition is recorded to the number of the Twelve at Jerusalem after Matthias.—**Ἀραβίαν.** No mention is made elsewhere of this journey; its object is clearly indicated by the context; for it is placed in strong contrast with human intercourse, and was, therefore, undertaken for the sake of solitary communion with God. The Arabian deserts were within easy reach of Damascus. Lightfoot suggests, indeed, that Paul perhaps repaired to Mount Sinai; but if the Apostle had been granted communion with God on Mount Sinai, the name would have constituted too effective an argument in favour of his Divine commission to be suppressed here. The Sinaitic peninsula was, in fact, remote from Damascus; the journey was at all times dangerous for travellers without escort, and in the year 37 (the most probable date of Saul's conversion) was hardly possible on account of war between King Aretas and the Romans.

Ver. 18. **Ἔπειτα.** The thrice-repeated **Ἔπειτα** in this verse, in ver. 21, and in ii. 1, singles out three events in the Apostle's life bearing on his intercourse with the Church of Jerusalem: his first introduction to them, his departure to a distant sphere of labour, and his return to Jerusalem with Barnabas. The object of this sketch was not to write a history of those years, but to fix attention on certain salient incidents which threw light on the real nature of his intercourse with Jerusalem. — **μετὰ τρία ἔτη.** A different preposition is here employed from that used in ii. 1, which describes a mission within fourteen years. In this case no precise date is implied; for the object is not to date the visit, but to show that three full years at least had elapsed before Paul had any intercourse with the Twelve.—**ἱστορῆσαι**: *to enquire of Cephas, i.e.*, to obtain information from him. This is the usual meaning of the verb; in Herodotus, and elsewhere, it denotes visits paid to places of interest with a view to getting information about them on the spot. The circumstances in which Paul found himself at that time make this sense very appropriate. He had been suddenly driven from his ministry at Damascus, and was compelled to seek a new sphere. He could not turn to any adviser more valuable than Peter for determining his future course. For that Apostle was not only prominent in the general government of the Church, but had taken the lead in its expansion by his visits to Samaria, to the maritime plain, and to Cæsarea, and by his baptism of Gentiles. In spite, therefore, of the danger of revisiting Jerusalem, Paul repaired thither to consult Peter as to how he could best serve Christ.—**Κηφᾶν.** Several MSS. give the Greek form, **Πέτρον**, of this name; but the Hebrew form appears to be the original reading throughout the Epistle, except in ii. 7, 8. At Jerusalem he was probably known by the name Cephas, but in the Greek Church at large by the name Peter.—**ἐπέμεινα.** Both in the Acts and in the Pauline Epistles this verb denotes the continuance or prolongation of a stay.—**πρὸς αὐτόν.** This can hardly be = **παρ' αὐτῷ**, *I abode with him.* The clause expresses rather the motive for Paul's lingering at Jerusalem, *I tarried to see him fifteen days.*

This narrative is so independent of the account given of Paul's first meeting with the Twelve in Acts ix. 26-29, that some critics question the identity of the

Κηφᾶν,[1] καὶ ἐπέμεινα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡμέρας δεκαπέντε· 19. ἕτερον δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων οὐκ εἶδον, εἰ μὴ Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ Κυρίου. 20. ἃ δὲ γράφω ὑμῖν, ἰδοὺ ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅτι οὐ ψεύδομαι. 21. Ἔπειτα ἦλθον εἰς τὰ κλίματα τῆς Συρίας καὶ τῆς Κιλικίας·

[1] Κηφαν ℵAB 17, etc.; Πετρον ℵ^{c}DEFGKLP.

two visits. But it is clear that both passages alike refer to Paul's first return to Jerusalem, after a prolonged sojourn at Damascus; and the subtle harmony of the two narratives is as conspicuous as their independence in details. The history states the bare fact that Paul, finding his life in imminent danger from the Jews at Damascus, fled to Jerusalem; the Epistle explains why he encountered so obvious a danger; the Epistle states that he prolonged his stay to see Peter; the history explains that he was unable to gain access to the Apostles for a time. The history records the principal events of the visit from the historical point of view, *e.g.*, the apprehensions felt by the Christian body, the intervention of Barnabas, the attempts on Paul's life; the autobiography passes these by as foreign to its purpose, but is far richer in personal details, relating incidentally the date, the motive, and the duration of the visit, and particularising the brethren whom Paul saw on the occasion; whereas in the Acts mention is merely made of the disciples generally.

Ver. 19. **εἰ μὴ Ἰάκωβον.** **εἰ μή** may either state an exception to the preceding negative clause (=*except, save*), or merely qualify it (=*but only*), as it does in Luke iv. 26, *to none of them, sc.*, the widows in Israel, *but only to Sarepta in Sidon;* and in Gal. i. 7, *no other Gospel, only* (**εἰ μή**) *there are some that pervert the Gospel.* The latter appears to be its meaning here. If James had been entitled an Apostle, the author would probably have written that he saw no other Apostles but Peter and James. But here he states emphatically that he saw no second (**ἕτερον**) Apostle, only James. The Epistle, like the Acts (see xii. 17, xv. 13, xxi. 18), fully recognises the leading position of James in the local Church (*cf.* ii. 9, 12); and the ecclesiastical tradition which entitles him Bishop of Jerusalem corresponds to this. All the evidence left of his life suggests that he clung throughout his Christian life to Jerusalem and did not undertake such missionary labours as would entitle him to the designation of Apostle.—**τὸν ἀδελφὸν** . . . James is here described as *the brother of the Lord* in order to distinguish him from James the son of Zebedee, who was living at the time of Paul's first visit; but elsewhere as James: after the death of the other James there could be no question who was meant.

Ver. 20. The solemnity of this appeal to God in attestation of His truth marks at once the importance which Paul attached to his independence of human teachers, and the persistency of the misrepresentation to which he had been exposed.—**ἰδοὺ.** This imperative is always used interjectionally in Scriptures: the subsequent **ὅτι** depends on **ἐνώπιον τ. Θεοῦ,** which has the force of an attestation.

Vv. 21-23. About ten years of the life of Paul, between his flight from Jerusalem to Tarsus and his return to Jerusalem for the Apostolic Council, are here passed over. They were spent, partly in and around Tarsus and Antioch, partly in the joint mission with Barnabas to Cyprus and Asia Minor. The Galatians were already acquainted with the leading facts of that period, and it was needless to refer to them here: enough that he spent those years, like those at Damascus, in an independent ministry at a distance from Jerusalem. He did indeed repair thither once with Barnabas to carry alms from Antioch to the Elders; but circumstances prevented any intercourse with the Twelve at that time: for before they reached the city the Herodian persecution had begun, and the leading Christians were in peril of death at the hands of Herod. Paul himself can only have paid a secret and hurried visit to the city, and thought it needless apparently to mention it in this place.—**κλίματα.** This word denotes the fringes of coastland sloping down from the mountains to the sea in north-western Syria and eastern, *i.e.* Roman, Cilicia. It is applied in 2 Cor. xi. 10 to the coastlands of Achaia.

The name Syria is placed before Cilicia, though the ministry at Tarsus preceded that at Antioch: for the latter was by far the more important and prolonged ministry. A further reason for placing

22. ἤμην δὲ ἀγνοούμενος τῷ προσώπῳ ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Ἰουδαίας ταῖς ἐν Χριστῷ· 23. μόνον δὲ ἀκούοντες ἦσαν ὅτι ὁ διώκων ἡμᾶς ποτε νῦν εὐαγγελίζεται τὴν πίστιν ἣν ποτε ἐπόρθει. 24. καὶ ἐδόξαζον ἐν ἐμοὶ τὸν Θεόν. II. 1. Ἔπειτα διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν πάλιν

Syria first was the subordinate position of Cilicia: for Roman Cilicia was, like Judæa, only a district of the great province of Syria, separately administered by an imperial procurator at Tarsus.

In Acts xv. 41 Syria and Cilicia are coupled together as forming a single region (**τὴν Συρίαν καὶ Κιλικίαν**), no article being inserted before **Κιλικίαν**; not so here, for the first ministry at Tarsus was distinct from that at Antioch.

Ver. 22. **ἤμην δὲ ἀγν.** The correct translation is not *I was unknown* (as our versions render it), but *I was becoming unknown*. At the beginning of this period he was a familiar figure in Jerusalem, but in the course of ten years' absence he gradually became a stranger to the Christians of Judæa.—**ἐκκλησίαις.** This passage speaks of the Churches of Judæa in the plural, as does also 1 Thess. ii. 14. In the Acts the Church throughout Judæa, Galilee and Samaria is described as a single Church according to the text of the best MSS. (ix. 31): the funds contributed for the relief of the poor Christians in Judæa are handed over to the Elders at Jerusalem (xi. 29, xii. 25); brethren from Judæa are censured as members of their own body by the assembled Church at Jerusalem (xv. 1, 24). It would seem from this that an effective unity of administration and control existed in Jerusalem side by side with local organisation of the several Churches of Judæa.

Ver. 23. *The faith* seems to be here identified with the living body of believers, for this verse describes Saul as making havoc of *the faith*, while ver. 13 applies that term to the *Church*.

Ver. 24. They glorified God in Saul, ascribing the change entirely to the grace of God working on his heart.

CHAPTER II.—Vv. 1-10. NARRATIVE OF THE AUTHOR'S VISIT WITH BARNABAS TO THE CHURCH OF JERUSALEM, HIS FRUITLESS NEGOTIATIONS WITH PARTY LEADERS, AND THE BROTHERLY WELCOME AND RECOGNITION HE RECEIVED FROM JAMES PETER AND JOHN.—The author has shown by a rapid glance over the first thirteen years of his Christian life how independent he had been of human teaching at his conversion and subsequently. He now proceeds to record the true history of the negotiations which he had undertaken at Jerusalem in conjunction with Barnabas in the fourteenth year of his ministry. (On the identity of this conference with the Apostolic Council, whose proceedings are recorded in Acts xv., see Introd., pp. 141-144). The Galatians were well aware of the position of Paul and Barnabas in the Church of Antioch: it was not therefore necessary to state in express terms that they were deputed to represent that Church. Enough that their first act was to lay before the Church of Jerusalem an account of the Gospel they were preaching to the Gentiles, and that their divine commission to the Gentiles was fully recognised by the leaders of the Church at Jerusalem. They knew already the general outline of events: for the resolution adopted at Jerusalem, and subsequently approved at Antioch, had been duly communicated to them by Paul himself. His object in this Epistle is to remove misconstruction as to his own position. His reference of this question to the Church of Jerusalem had been misrepresented as an act of submission and acknowledgment of his own inferiority, whereas he had really procured the condemnation of *the false brethren* who denied his authority, had silenced his opponents, and met with brotherly fellowship and full recognition at the hands of James Peter and John.

Ver. 1. **διὰ δεκατ. ἐτῶν.** Greek usage in calculating intervals of time between two events reckons two years for the two broken years at the beginning and end of the period. Some critics, notably Lightfoot, calculate this period from the meeting with Peter mentioned in i. 18: but this attaches far too much importance to that interview. It is only mentioned and its date loosely indicated in order to show that three full years passed before they had any intercourse. The dominant note of time throughout in the mind of the author is surely the conversion: and the object of specifying a period of time here, as in i. 18, is to show how many years of Christian life had passed before the event.—**Τίτον.** The names of the Christians who accompanied Paul and Barnabas are not given in Acts xv. 2. It appears that Titus, a Greek Christian,

ἀνέβην εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα μετὰ Βαρνάβα, συμπαραλαβὼν καὶ Τίτον· 2. ἀνέβην δὲ κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν, καὶ ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ κηρύσσω ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι, κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσι, μή πως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον 3. (ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Τίτος ὁ σὺν ἐμοὶ, Ἕλλην ὤν,

one of Paul's own children in Christ, was among them, and that Paul was responsible for his selection. His choice of a Greek for his companion evinces the determined spirit with which he started on his mission.

Ver. 2. **κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν.** This statement of Paul's motive is in no way inconsistent with the independent statement in the Acts that he was deputed by the Church. The revelation may have come to Paul himself, and in that case he prompted the decision of the Church, of which he and Barnabas were at that time the ruling spirits; or it may have been made through the Spirit to the Church, in which case Paul would count it right at once to obey his voice. —**ἀνεθέμην . . .** Two different methods of action are here specified, public addresses describing the nature and result of the Apostle's preaching among the Greeks, and private interviews with individual brethren or groups of brethren. The term **κατ' ἰδίαν** does not imply secrecy in these communications. The context shows that the point at issue was the circumcision of Gentile converts. —**τοῖς δοκοῦσιν.** As this phrase recurs four times in eight verses, it is necessary to determine its true meaning with some precision. **δοκεῖν** nowhere else conveys the idea of superiority implied in our versions, *of reputation* (*of repute* R.V.). The two passages adduced in its support do not stand the test of criticism: in Eur., *Heracl.*, 897 there is an obvious ellipsis of **εὐτυχεῖν**, in *Hec.*, 295 of **δόξαν ἔχειν.** In the latter indeed **δοκούντων** appears to be a cynical comment of the deposed queen on the unreality of outward glory.

In fact **δοκεῖν**, like *seem* in English, was either a neutral term which expressed according to the context any impression, good or bad, produced by the appearance of an object, or it laid stress on the unreality of the mere outward semblance. The Greeks dwelt often on the contrast between **δοκεῖν** and **εἶναι** embodied in the famous line of Æschylus **οὐ γὰρ δοκεῖν δίκαιος ἀλλ' εἶναι θέλει.** In ver. 6 this contrast reappears in the antithesis between **δοκοῦντες εἶναι** and **ποτε ἦσαν.** In ver. 9, on the contrary, **οἱ δοκοῦντες,** coupled as it is there with **στύλοι εἶναι,** denotes the high estimate formed of the Three. The elliptical phrase **ἀνεθέμην τοῖς δοκοῦσιν** in ver. 2 should in like manner be interpreted by the context. I take it to mean **ἀνεθέμην οἷς ἐδόκει δεῖν ἀναθέσθαι.** Paul, as he states, brought the matter in private interviews before those whom it seemed right to approach in that way, *sc.*, influential opponents, whose hostility he was anxious to deprecate.—**μή πως . . .** It was of vital moment to the welfare of the Greek Churches at that time to avoid a breach with Jerusalem. Besides embracing a minority of Jewish Christians, they were leavened through and through with Jewish influences, so that a quarrel might have led to a disastrous schism in all the existing Churches. More than this, they relied still mainly on the Old Testament for the basis of their theology and morals. The abundant promise of harvest among the Greeks rested still on the nucleus of devout Gentiles who had been prepared by the teaching of the synagogue for the lessons of Christ's Apostles. **τρέχω . . . ἔδραμον.** The present subjunctive is coupled here with the aorist indicative, as it is in 1 Thess. iii. 5, to express the fear of present failure, coupled with a dread that past labours had been rendered futile.

Ver. 3. *Howbeit even Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, had not been compelled to be circumcised.* The last verse related the steps taken by Paul to disarm opposition. He was, however, no less resolute in his resistance to any encroachment on Christian freedom. The presence of Titus with him attested his determination; for the circumcision of Titus had been demanded, and resisted evidently by Paul himself. It is a strange misconception of critics to argue as if this struggle over Titus took place at Jerusalem. The demand for the circumcision of all converts was made at Antioch and pressed against the authority of Paul and Barnabas (Acts xx. 2): the express object of the deputation was to protest against this demand, which they did with entire success. The Greek aorist **ἠναγκάσθη** answers here to the English pluperfect, as often elsewhere (*cf.* Winer, xl., 5).

ἠναγκάσθη περιτμηθῆναι·), 4. διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους, οἵτινες παρεισῆλθον κατασκοπῆσαι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῶν ἣν ἔχομεν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα ἡμᾶς καταδουλώσουσιν[1]· 5. οἷς οὐδὲ[2] πρὸς ὥραν εἴξαμεν τῇ ὑποταγῇ, ἵνα ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου διαμείνῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς. 6. Ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναί τι (ὁποῖοί ποτε

[1] καταδουλωσουσιν ℵABCDEFG; -σονται L; -σωνται K.
[2] οις ουδε ℵABCD$^{corr.}$EFGKLP; om. D.

Ver. 4. The narrative returns here, after the parenthetical reference to Titus, to the subject of vv. 1, 2, and the verb **ἀνέβην**, already repeated in ver. 2, must here also be supplied to complete the sense: *But it was because of the false brethren privily brought in that I went up, men who came in. . . .* The addition of the article, rightly inserted by the Revised Version before *false brethren*, shows that they were a particular body of convicted offenders against Christ, of whose guilt the Galatians had been already informed. The force of **παρεισάκτους** is well illustrated by *Strabo*, xvii., p. 794, where it denotes the treacherous introduction of foreign enemies into a city by a faction within the walls. In the next clause **παρεισῆλθον** describes the stealthy entrance of these secret foes; **κατασκοπῆσαι** marks their hostile intent, and likens them to spies who are bent on discovering to an enemy the weak points in a military position: the freedom of the Greek Churches in Christ is further declared to be the object of their hostility. This description brings the Epistle into close touch with the Acts: for it is there stated that Paul and Barnabas were driven to go up to Jerusalem by the factious opposition of certain foreign emissaries from Judæa who attacked the freedom of the Greek converts from circumcision and disturbed the peace of the Church; also that these men were altogether repudiated and condemned at Jerusalem by the Apostles and brethren, and finally that the document embracing this sentence of condemnation had been placed by Paul himself in the hands of the Galatians. There can be no doubt, in view of this close correspondence, that the false brethren whom the Epistle denounces are identical with the Pharisaic emissaries who stirred up strife at Antioch. **—καταδουλώσουσιν.** All the best MSS. agree in reading this future indicative instead of the subjunctive after **ἵνα**; possibly the author meant to express thereby the assured hope of success, and not merely the intention of the conspirators.

Ver. 5. **εἴξαμεν.** Paul here couples Barnabas with himself in recording the determined resistance offered by both to the demand for the circumcision of all Christians preferred at Antioch. Barnabas was at that time a staunch supporter of Greek freedom. The verse obviously refers to their attitude at Antioch before going to Jerusalem.—**τῇ ὑποταγῇ**: *by our submission.* Here, as in 2 Cor. ix. 13, **ὑποταγή** denotes a voluntary act, not one imposed upon a subject. The same rendering appears more appropriate for expressing the due attitude of wife and children in 1 Tim. ii. 11, iii. 4. The middle voice **ὑποτάσσεσθαι** is five times rendered *submit* in the Authorised Version, and the force of the original is impaired by its exclusion from the text of the Revised Version.—**ἵνα . . .** The motive for firmness was the maintenance *of* the truth of the Gospel, *i.e.*, of the freedom to which the uncircumcised were entitled in Christ. —**πρὸς ὑμᾶς**: *for you, i.e.*, with a view to your welfare. The rendering of our versions, *with you*, would be properly expressed by **ἐν ὑμῖν.**

Ver. 6. The author here resumes the broken thread of the narrative, which he interrupted after ver. 2 in order to show that his conciliatory attitude at Jerusalem was not due to weakness or irresolution. He now proceeds to relate the sequel of the advances which he made at Jerusalem to the Pharisaic party. The repetition of the phrase **οἱ δοκοῦντες**, and the fresh transition from the plural **εἴξαμεν** to the singular **ἐμοί**, indicate the fresh shifting of the scene from Antioch back to Jerusalem. The first clause is left unfinished, for the mention of these men *who seemed to be anything* leads the author to interrupt his narrative again that he may challenge their right to be heard; he breaks, accordingly, into the disparaging comment, *what manner of men they had once been, maketh no matter*—a forcible expression of his disappointment at finding so little Christian sympathy or life where he had hoped to find so much. After this parenthesis he remoulds the

ἦσαν οὐδέν μοι διαφέρει· πρόσωπον Θεὸς ἀνθρώπου οὐ λαμβάνει)—
ἐμοὶ γὰρ οἱ δοκοῦντες οὐδὲν προσανέθεντο. 7. Ἀλλὰ τοὐναντίον,
ἰδόντες ὅτι πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας, καθὼς
Πέτρος τῆς περιτομῆς 8. (ὁ γὰρ ἐνεργήσας Πέτρῳ εἰς ἀποστολὴν
τῆς περιτομῆς ἐνήργησε καὶ ἐμοὶ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη), 9. καὶ γνόντες τὴν
χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι, Ἰάκωβος καὶ Κηφᾶς[1] καὶ Ἰωάννης, οἱ

[1] I. και Κηφας ℵBCKLP; Πετρος και I. DEFG.

form of his sentence; and **οἱ δοκοῦντες,** the subject of **ἦσαν,** becomes the subject of the verb **προσανέθεντο.** Instead, therefore, of concluding the sentence in its original form, and stating that *from those who so seemed* he got no response, he writes, *to me, I say, those who so seemed communicated nothing further.*—**τῶν δοκούντων εἶναί τι.** These are identified with **τοῖς δοκοῦσιν** in ver. 2. They are there described as men whom it was thought advisable to approach in private, here as men who were thought *to be anything, i.e.*, to have any weight in the Church. The English version *somewhat* suggests that they held high office and were in positions of dignity, perhaps Apostles; but the Greek order in that case must have been **τί εἶναι,** nor can that emphasis be justified in rendering the enclitic **τι** after **εἶναι.** They were probably party-leaders, but the Apostle writes of them with scant respect as men who were now little better than a name. —**ὁποῖοί ποτε ἦσαν . . .**: *What manner of men they had once been maketh no matter to me.* The margin of the Revised Version rightly renders **ὁποῖοι** as an indirect interrogative dependent on **διαφέρει,** and gives to **ποτε** its true sense of *formerly, in time past* (as in i. 13, 23). Coupled as it is here with **ποτε, ἦσαν** has the force of a pluperfect, and contrasts the character of these men as reported from past time with what Paul actually found them to be: he could get no brotherly help or counsel from them. Therefore he pronounces the adverse judgment upon them (**πρόσωπον . . . λαμβάνει**); for, like his Master (Luke xx. 21), he regarded no man's person, if weighed in the balance and found wanting.—**ἐμοὶ . . . προσανέθεντο.** This clause forms an antithesis to **ἀνεθέμην τοῖς δοκοῦσιν** in ver. 2. Paul had laid before them an account of his successful ministry among the Greeks, but they had no further response to make in the shape of Christian sympathy, or of fresh argument in justification of their prejudices against him and his teaching.

Ver. 7. The emphatic opening of this verse, **Ἀλλὰ τοὐναντίον,** gives prominence to the thorough contrast presented by James, Cephas and John to the cold reserve of these suspicious and prejudiced opponents. It is perfectly clear in the Greek text, though unfortunately not in the English versions, that *they* are the subject throughout vv. 7-9, and that the participles **ἰδόντες** and **γνόντες** refer to *them* as well as the verb **ἔδωκαν.** *But contrariwise James and Cephas and John . . . when they saw . . . and perceived the grace that was given unto me, gave to me and Barnabas right hands of fellowship.* They saw in the marvellous success of Paul and Barnabas a visible token of their divine commission and of the grace bestowed upon them. These were doubtless the real authors of the final resolution adopted by the Council; and its hearty appreciation of their *beloved Barnabas and Paul, men that have hazarded their lives for the name of the Lord Jesus Christ* coincides with the language of the Epistle.—**Πέτρος.** In this and the next verse the Greek name is used to designate the Apostle of the circumcision, probably because he was already known to the whole Greek world as an Apostle under that name. In Jerusalem, however, and as a man, he habitually went by his Hebrew surname Cephas, and that name is accordingly given him elsewhere in the Epistle.

Ver. 8. **ἐνεργήσας.** When this verb is applied to the work of the Spirit in the hearts of men, the preposition **ἐν** is added to it. The absence of **ἐν** before **Πέτρῳ** and **ἐμοί** indicates that this verse is not describing the work of grace in the hearts of Peter and Paul, but the work of God *for* them, *i.e.*, for the furtherance of the Gospel which they preached.

Ver. 9. The name of James is placed before those of the Apostles Peter and John. This was probably because as permanent head of the local Church he presided at meetings (*cf.* Acts xxi. 18). The well-known strictness of his own

δοκοῦντες στύλοι εἶναι, δεξιὰς ἔδωκαν ἐμοὶ καὶ Βαρνάβᾳ κοινωνίας, ἵνα ἡμεῖς[1] εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰς τὴν περιτομήν· 10. μόνον τῶν πτωχῶν ἵνα μνημονεύωμεν, ὃ καὶ ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι. 11. Ὅτε δὲ ἦλθε Κηφᾶς[2] εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν, κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ

[1] ημεις ℵBFGKLP; ημεις μεν ℵ[a]ACDE.
[2] Κηφας ℵABCHP; Πετρος DEFGKL.

legal observance gave special weight to his support of Greek freedom on this occasion. A comparison of his address with the subsequent resolution of the Council suggests that he took a leading part in drafting some part of it at least. —**οἱ δοκοῦντες στύλοι εἶναι.** The habitual application to the Church of figures borrowed from a temple of God suggested the description of Apostles as pillars. It occurs also in Clement of Rome and Ignatius. The repetition of the phrase **οἱ δοκοῦντες** is apparently designed to contrast the high estimate formed of the Three with the unfounded and indefinite estimate of others who had proved to be mere names.—**ἵνα . . .** The mutual understanding between the two groups of Apostles obviously did not imply an absolute restriction of each to one section of the Church. All converts alike were members of a single united Church: circumstances of themselves forbade any definite division: Paul opened his ministry everywhere in the synagogue, and numbered Jews as well as Greeks amidst his converts. So Peter again is next found at Antioch.

Ver. 10. **μόνον . . . ἵνα.** A verb must be supplied out of **δεξιὰς ἔδωκαν** expressive of the pledge that the other Apostles exacted from Barnabas and Paul. **τῶν πτωχῶν.** These words are displaced from their grammatical position after **μνημονεύωμεν** in order to lay stress upon the poor being the central object of the appeal. Judæa suffered often from famine in apostolic times, and Christians were probably the worst sufferers owing to religious ill-will and social persecution. This passage implies chronic poverty. So also does the history of the Pauline contribution, which was not an effort to meet a special emergency, for it took more than a year to collect, but a fund organised to meet a permanent demand for systematic help.—**ὅ.** The addition of **τοῦτο** after **αὐτό** shows that **ὅ** is not the object of **ποιῆσαι,** but is used with adverbial force for a connecting particle, as in i. 7, *as for which.*—**καὶ ἐσπούδασα**: not *I also,* for this would require **καὶ ἐγώ** in the Greek text. The force of **καί** is to intensify the following verb. *I was not only willing, but was indeed zealous to do so.*

Vv. 11-14. Intrigue at Antioch to affix the stigma of uncleanness on uncircumcised brethren, countenanced by Peter and Barnabas, but openly rebuked by Paul.—The gathering of many Christians at Antioch after the Apostolic Council during the sojourn of Paul and Barnabas in that city is recorded in the Acts, but no mention is made of Peter or of this episode. The omission is instructive, for it bears out the impression which the Epistle itself conveys that the collision was a transitory incident, and had no lasting effect on Church history. The fact, however, that Peter and Barnabas both consented to affix the stigma of uncleanness on their uncircumcised brethren rather than incur the obloquy of eating with them bears striking testimony to the strength of the prejudices which then prevailed among Jewish Christians. Neither of them had any real scruples about intercourse with these brethren: Peter had been taught of God long ago not to call any unclean whom God had cleansed, and had recently protested at Jerusalem against laying the yoke of the Law upon the neck of the disciples; Barnabas had ministered for years to Greek converts, had championed their cause at Jerusalem with Paul, and had like Peter consorted with them freely of late: yet neither of them had the moral courage to act up to their convictions under the eyes of the brethren from Jerusalem. Their vacillation attests the difficulty of retaining Jews and Greeks in one communion, and the wisdom and prudence which guided the decision of the Apostolic Council. But that decision had materially strengthened Paul's position. A basis of union had been formally ratified between the two Churches of Jerusalem and Antioch. The Church of Jerusalem by calling on Greek Christians to consent, as they had done, to certain prescribed forms of abstinence had virtually bound themselves to accept these

ἀντέστην, ὅτι κατεγνωσμένος ἦν. 12. πρὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἐλθεῖν τινὰς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου, μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν συνήσθιεν· ὅτε δὲ ἦλθον,[1] ὑπέστελλε καὶ

[1] ηλθον ACD^{3}EHKLP; ηλθεν ℵBD^{1}FG.

as conditions of intercourse, and the withdrawal from the common meal violated therefore the spirit of a solemn treaty. Paul had therefore strong ground for remonstrance, independently of his authority in his own Church, and his protest was evidently effectual, though he refrains from recording Peter's humiliating retreat from a false position. For it is recorded here for the express purpose of exemplifying his successful vindication of his apostolic rights.

The early Fathers shrank from admitting the moral cowardice of which Peter was guilty on this occasion, and made various efforts to evade the plain sense. Clement of Alexandria questioned the identity of Cephas with the Apostle. Origen propounded a theory that the scene was a preconcerted plot between the two Apostles for the confutation of the Judaisers; and this theory prevailed extensively in spite of the discredit which it cast on the character of both until it was effectually exposed by Augustine in controversy with Jerome, who had himself adopted it.

Again, this momentary collision between the two great Apostles was distorted by party spirit into an evidence of personal rivalry. Their preeminence in their two respective spheres has been already noted as early as the Apostolic Council, and this led, perhaps inevitably, to personal comparison. In the Corinthian Church opposite partisans adopted their names for rival watch-words. At a later time elaborate fictions of their lifelong antagonism were invented and circulated in the Clementine literature. But the collision here mentioned was obviously a transitory incident. The language of gratitude and esteem applied to Peter elsewhere in the Epistle precludes any idea of permanent estrangement. — **ὅτι κατεγνωσμένος ἦν.** Our versions are surely wrong in giving a causal force to **ὅτι** in this clause, for it adduces no clear and reasonable justification of the opposition offered. It is much better to take **ὅτι** as declarative: Paul is here stating the ground which he took up against Peter: *I withstood him, saying that he had condemned himself.* He urged that Peter was condemned by his own inconsistency. By first eating with Gentiles and then pressing upon them observance of the very principles that he had violated he was playing fast and loose with the Law.

Ver. 12. **Ἰακώβου.** Any visitors from the Church of Jerusalem might perhaps be said to come from James, who was its permanent head; but these brethren appear to have been in special sympathy with James in regard to their strict observance of the Law, and the respect paid by Peter to their opinion suggests that they were representative men, probably deputed for some purpose by their Church. There is, however, no reason to conclude that James prompted or approved the intrigue against Gentile freedom at Antioch. Scrupulous as he was about observing the Law, he had taken a leading part at Jerusalem in shaping the recent contract with their Gentile brethren, and was the last man to sanction an evasion of its terms.

The imperfect tenses **ὑπέστελλεν, ἀφώριζεν** give a graphic picture of Peter's irresolute and tentative efforts to withdraw gradually from an intercourse that gave offence to the visitors.—**τ. ἐκ περιτομῆς.** The omission of **τῆς** before **περιτομῆς** is conclusive against the rendering of our versions, *them . . . of the circumcision.* For **περιτομή** without an article does not denote the body of men, but the rite. By **τ. ἐκ περιτομῆς** are meant the party who based their faith on circumcision, and made that the charter of God's covenant rather than baptism, and not the Jewish Christians in general. It is clear from the context that the Circumcision as a body did eat with their brethren until Peter set the example of withdrawal through fear of this determined minority of partisans. In Acts xi. 2 the phrase obviously singles out a particular party who pressed the claims of circumcision in an assembly consisting wholly of circumcised men. In Acts x. 45 **οἱ ἐκ π. πιστοί** distinguishes those who believed after circumcision from the uncircumcised who believed; and in Col. iv. 11 **οἱ ὄντες ἐκ π. οὗτοι μόνοι συνεργοί** designates *those men who were my only fellow-workers after circumcision.* (For the force of the elliptical phrase **οἱ ἐκ** *cf.* iii. 7, 9, Rom. iv. 14.)

Ver. 13. **συνυπεκρίθησαν . . . ὑποκρί-**

ἀφώριζεν ἑαυτὸν, φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς. 13. καὶ συνυπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ Ἰουδαῖοι, ὥστε καὶ Βαρνάβας συναπήχθη αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει. 14. Ἀλλ᾽ ὅτε εἶδον ὅτι οὐκ ὀρθοποδοῦσι πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, εἶπον τῷ Κηφᾷ[1] ἔμπροσθεν πάντων, Εἰ σὺ, Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων, ἐθνικῶς ζῇς καὶ οὐκ Ἰουδαϊκῶς, πῶς[2] τὰ ἔθνη ἀναγκάζεις Ἰουδαΐζειν; 15. ἡμεῖς φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ οὐκ ἐξ

[1] Κηφᾳ ℵABC 17, etc.; Πετρῳ DEFGKLP.
[2] πως ℵABCDEFGP; τι KL.

σει. The verb ὑποκρίνεσθαι is often used of playing a part as an actor in a play without any invidious meaning; but ὑπόκρισις corresponds throughout the N.T. to its English equivalent *hypocrisy*, and fidelity to the Greek text almost demands that rendering here. The men who had hitherto eaten with the uncircumcised and now withdrew because they shrank from giving offence were, in fact, affecting religious scruples which they did not feel, and the Apostle does not hesitate to denounce such insincerity by its true name *hypocrisy*.—**καὶ Βαρνάβας**: *even Barnabas*. The defection of Barnabas was a heavier blow to the cause of Gentile freedom than the vacillation of Peter. With the single exception of Paul himself, Barnabas had been the most effective minister of Christ for the conversion of Greeks; he had been of late deputed to appear with Paul as their representative in Jerusalem, and his withdrawal from social communion with Greek Christians fell upon them with the force of a betrayal. Yet Paul, who had been for many years his most intimate companion, and knew his heart, writes more in sorrow than in anger of his lamentable weakness in being led away by evil example. For he saw that he was the victim of stronger wills than his own. Jerusalem had been his early home and the place of his earliest ministry. The Twelve had been his first teachers in Christ: his cousin John Mark, who was even then in Antioch, was so dear to him that Barnabas, when driven to choose between him and Paul, chose Mark for the companion of his future ministry. What wonder then that he was tempted on this occasion for a moment to yield to the influence of Peter and the brethren from Jerusalem!

Ver. 14. **πρὸς τ. ἀλήθειαν.** Our versions render **πρός**, *according to*, like **κατά**: and so impugn these men for want of uprightness in their conduct rather than for inconsistency of doctrine. But the censure of the Apostle is really directed to the falsehood of their teaching. They *were not dealing straightforwardly with the truth* in casting the slur of uncleanness on those whom God had cleansed in Christ.—**ἀναγκάζεις.** Peter was by his example really putting a severe pressure on Gentile converts to adopt a Jewish rule of life, though perhaps unintentionally.—**ὑπάρχων.** This participle notes the bearing of antecedents on present action. Peter being a Jew might have been expected to act otherwise.

Vv. 15-21. JEWS THEMSELVES WERE DRIVEN TO RESORT TO CHRIST AS SINNERS FOR PARDON BECAUSE THEY COULD NOT OBTAIN JUSTIFICATION BY PERFECT OBEDIENCE TO THE LAW—NOT THAT THEY MIGHT THEREBY BECOME MORE FREE TO SIN, BUT FOR THE SAKE OF NEW LIFE IN CHRIST, EVEN AS PAUL HIMSELF ENDURED CRUCIFIXION WITH CHRIST, THAT CHRIST MIGHT LIVE IN HIM. Ver. 15. As the next verse opens, according to the Greek MSS., with **εἰδότες δὲ**, it is necessary to understand here a finite verb, *We are Jews*, etc.

The personal narrative breaks on abruptly at this point. Peter drops out of sight, and the Epistle passes from a protest against his vacillation into an elaborate argument against the doctrinal errors of the Pharisaic party, which forms too integral a portion of the whole Epistle to be detached from it. Yet the new strain of thought springs so directly out of the previous remonstrance that it might well have been addressed there and then to the Jewish Christians at Antioch. The outspoken protest against an insidious attempt to force on Gentiles the Jewish rule of life leads naturally to an enquiry what this rule has done for men who are Jews by birth. Did it justify them before God? We know that it did not: they had to turn to Christ for the peace with God which the Law could not give. In short, vv. 15-21 are connected at once with the preceding matter

ἐθνῶν ἁμαρτωλοί, 16. εἰδότες δὲ[1] ὅτι οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ,[2] καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν, ἵνα δικαιωθῶμεν ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου· ὅτι[3] ἐξ ἔργων νόμου[4] οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σάρξ. 17. εἰ δὲ ζητοῦντες δικαιωθῆναι ἐν Χριστῷ εὑρέθημεν

[1] δε ℵBCD¹E¹FGL ; om. AD³KP.
[2] Χριστου Ιησου AB 17 ; I. Χριστου ℵCDEFGKLP.
[3] οτι ℵABDFG 17, etc. ; διοτι CD³EKLP.
[4] εξ εργων νομου before ου δικ. ℵABCDEFGP.

and the subsequent; and apparently reproduce in substance an argument which had already been addressed, *viva voce*, to the circumcision-party at Antioch, whom the Apostle identifies in spirit and policy with the subsequent agitators in Galatia. —**οὐκ ἐξ ἐθνῶν ἁμ.** This clause expresses pointedly the insolent contempt of the Pharisaic party for Gentiles, who did not belong to the holy nation nor inherit the Law and the Covenants. Yet in spite of these arrogant pretensions to superior sanctity (it is added) they were driven by the verdict of their own conscience to embrace the faith of Christ because they knew that no flesh could possibly be so perfect in obedience to Law as to be thereby justified.

Ver. 16. **οὐ δικαιοῦται . . .** Two methods of seeking justification in the sight of God are here distinguished. The former took account of nothing but stedfast obedience to the law of God. Before his conversion Paul knew no other: he had been taught by his legal training to base his standard of right and wrong entirely on the revealed law, to find in it the sole guide of conscience, and to measure righteousness by conformity to its commandments alone.

But his view of God's judgment had been profoundly modified by his conversion. He had learnt on the one hand from the teaching of Christ how impossible it was for man to attain to perfect righteousness, seeing that God claims not only obedience to the letter of the law, but an allegiance of the heart too thorough to be attainable by human infirmity. But on the other hand he knew now that God is a loving Father in Christ, ever seeking out His erring children that He may win them back, ever ready to temper strict justice with infinite mercy, and waiting only for the first response of imperfect faith and imperfect repentance, so they be at all sincere, to blot out a guilty past, and pronounce a favourable judgment on the sinner. He perceived that there is room in the judgment of God for another element beside strict justice, *viz.*, the mercy of the judge, and that a prisoner, however clear may be his guilt on the evidence of his life, may nevertheless be assured of pardon and acceptance by throwing himself in humble trust on that mercy. In the Epistles of Paul accordingly justification acquired a new meaning, becoming equivalent to acceptance before God, and the term righteousness was applied to the merciful acquittal of the guilty but penitent offender.

The clause **ἐξ ἔργων νόμου** defines an acquittal on the merits of the case alone, based on a life of holy obedience, while **διὰ πίστεως Ἰ. Χρ.** points to faith in Christ as the appointed channel of God's mercy.—**ἐπιστεύσαμεν.** Here, as in Rom. xiii. 11, this verb denotes the act of embracing the faith. Jewish Christians had by their conversion declared the hopelessness of their position under the Law without Christ. Faith in him was (they saw) the only means of obtaining justification.—**διότι . . .** This clause corroborates the verdict of conscience and experience by the authority of Scripture, for it adopts the language of Ps. cxlii. (cxliii.) 2, **οὐ δικαιωθήσεται ἐνώπιόν σου πᾶς ζῶν**, with only some verbal alterations suggested by the context of the Epistle. As two kinds of justification have been mentioned, the clause **ἐξ ἔργων νόμου** is required here to make it clear that the justification to which the Psalm refers was legal, the words **ἐνώπιόν σου** are dropped as needless in this context, and **πᾶσα σάρξ** is substituted for **πᾶς ζῶν** in order to show that the Psalm referred to earthly life. The passage is quoted with corresponding verbal changes in Rom. iii. 20.

Ver. 17. **εἰ δὲ . . . ἁμαρτωλοί.** The last verse arrived at the conclusion that Jewish converts by their own act con-

καὶ αὐτοὶ ἁμαρτωλοί, ἆρα Χριστὸς ἁμαρτίας διάκονος; μὴ γένοιτο. 18. εἰ γὰρ ἃ κατέλυσα, ταῦτα πάλιν οἰκοδομῶ, παραβάτην ἐμαυτὸν συνιστάνω.[1] 19. Ἐγὼ γὰρ διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον, ἵνα Θεῷ ζήσω.

[1] συνιστανω ℵABCDFGP.

demned themselves to be guilty of a broken law. The argument now proceeds on this assumption "*If* it be true (as has been shown) that *we by seeking to be justified in Christ were found to be ourselves also sinners* as well as the Gentiles —if our sin was then discovered, and it be admitted that confession of sin lies at the root of all Christian life, what then is the attitude of Christ toward sin?"— **ἆρα Χ. ἁ. διάκονος;** This clause is clearly interrogative, and the true reading is **ἆρα**, not **ἄρα** (inferential). For here, as always elsewhere in Pauline language, **μὴ γένοιτο** repudiates a monstrous suggestion, put forward in the form of a question, the mere statement of which is repugnant to the moral sense.

It was objected to this doctrine of God's free grace in Christ to guilty sinners that it held out a license to sin by doing away the wholesome restraints of the Law, and so encouraged men to continue in sin by its assurance of pardon. The fallacy is here dismissed with scorn on the strength of the very nature of Christ, but is more fully exposed in the sixth chapter to the Romans.

Ver. 18. "If, indeed, I do reestablish the authority of the Law over Christian life, it becomes true that Christ did lead me to transgression." So argues the Apostle as he turns to his own life for an illustration of the incompatibility of allegiance to Christ with the continued supremacy of the Law.

Ver. 19. **Ἐγὼ.** The stress laid on the personal pronoun shows that Paul is here referring to the facts of his personal history. He singles out his own conversion for the sake of the crucial example which it afforded of the difficulty of reconciling the commands of Christ with the traditional law of Israel, for he was actually bearing the commission of the high priest, and carrying out the orders of the Sanhedrim when Christ met him in the way and laid His commands upon him. He had to choose between the two: and at Christ's word he flung up his office and renounced for ever the service of the Law. — **διὰ νόμου**: *though under law*. The translation of these words in our versions *through the law* seems to me fatal to the sense: for the death to Law which is here recorded was not due to the instrumentality of Law, but was the immediate effect of the vision and words of Christ; and the express object of this reference to the conversion of Saul is to show how union with Christ annihilates the authority of an outward law. **διὰ νόμου** is really akin to **διὰ γράμματος καὶ περιτομῆς** in Rom. ii. 27, and to **δι' ἀκροβυστίας** in Rom. iv. 11. In all these cases **διά** denotes the environment, whether of the letter, of circumcision, of uncircumcision, or of law, which was subsisting at the time. Saul was on official duty, surrounded by the circumstances and machinery of Law when Christ stayed him, and he became at once dead to the claim of Law upon him. — ***νόμῳ ἀπέθανον.*** These words give a vivid description of the spiritual revulsion produced by his conversion in the heart of Saul. Whereas, hitherto, his whole mind had been set on fulfilling the whole Law, and he had counted its obligations all in all to him, he now entirely renounced the duty of obedience to its commands and repudiated its authority. And just as death works a final change, and leaves behind an indelible effect, so did his conversion affix a permanent stamp of lifelong change on all his after years: thenceforth he served another Master, owned absolute obedience to His will, listened for His inward voice or outward revelation, and drank of His Spirit.

The absence of the article before **νόμῳ** is noteworthy; whereas the Law of Moses, being the one revealed Law, is always designated *the Law* (**ὁ νόμος**), **νόμῳ** denotes law in the abstract, so that this clause comprehends emancipation from all control of external law. The freedom was, of course, purely spiritual: Paul continued fully to acknowledge the duty of outward submission to all duly ordained authority, but maintained the absolute independence of his spirit and conscience from its dictates.—**ἵνα Θεῷ ζήσω.** This clause adds the motive for this death to Law. It was a veritable death unto life: Saul had striven in vain to obtain life before God by zealous fulfilment of every commandment; he now acknowledged his utter failure, surren-

20. Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι· ζῶ δὲ οὐκ ἔτι ἐγώ, ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός· ὃ δὲ νῦν ζῶ ἐν σαρκί, ἐν πίστει ζῶ τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ,[1] τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ. 21. οὐκ ἀθετῶ τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ· εἰ γὰρ διὰ νόμου δικαιοσύνη, ἄρα Χριστὸς δωρεὰν ἀπέθανεν.

[1] τ. υιου τ. Θεου ℵACD³EKLP ; τ. Θεου και Χριστου BD¹FG.

dered all the pride and ambition of his life, and cast himself in humble trust at the feet of Jesus to receive from Him that precious life which he had sought in vain by his most zealous efforts under the Law.

Ver. 20. **Χριστῷ συνεστ.** The Greek order throws special emphasis on **Χριστῷ**: union with Christ became from that time the central feature of his life; it entailed in the beginning a fellowship with his crucifixion, a real crucifixion of heart and will. By this figure he describes the intense agony of spiritual conflict, the crushing load of shame and bitter remorse which he underwent during the three days of darkness and silent despair that followed his vision of the Christ.—**ζῶ δὲ**: *And I live.* I can perceive no ground for rendering **δέ** *nevertheless* (A.V.) or *yet* (R.V.). There is no contrast here between the life and the previous death: on the contrary, the life is presented as the direct outcome of the death. As the resurrection of Christ was the sequel of the crucifixion, so Paul was joined to Christ in death that he might be joined to Him in spiritual life.—**οὐκ ἔτι . . .** The new life is no longer, like the former, dependent on the struggling efforts of a mere man to draw near to God in his own righteousness. Christ Himself is its source, as the vine is the source of life to the branches.—**ὃ δὲ ζῶ**: *But in that I live.* Our versions make this = **ἣν ζωὴν ζῶ**; but it seems to me more accordant with the context and with Greek forms of expression to make **ὅ** = *in that*, as it is rendered by A.V. in Rom. vi. 10. Two instances of this adverbial use of **ὅ** for a connecting particle have been already noted in this Epistle (i. 7, ii. 10). Paul is here accounting for the fact that he now possesses spiritual life, though still in the flesh and subject to motions of sin in his members: it belongs to him in virtue of his faith in the Son of God.—**με . . . ἐμοῦ.** The previous clauses have expressed the intimate personal union between the spirit of Paul and his Divine Master. In harmony with that view an exclusive personal aspect is presented of the love of Christ and of His sacrifice on the Cross, as though Paul himself had been their sole object.

Ver. 21. Christ died in order that men might live before God by His grace in spite of a broken Law; if men could keep the Law of themselves and live, there would be no call for grace, and the death of Christ would be proved a useless sacrifice.—**διὰ νόμου.** Law was never, like faith, instrumental to justification (*cf.* ver. 16). Accordingly, Paul never speaks of justification through Law, but either **ἐκ νόμου** or **ἐν νόμῳ.** Here, as in ver. 19, **διὰ νόμου** really denotes a legal environment, and the verse argues that if righteousness was really within men's reach under a legal dispensation, then there was no occasion for the death of Christ at all.

CHAPTER III.—Vv. 1-6. WHAT SENSELESS FOLLY IS IT FOR YOU, WHO HAD THE CRUCIFIXION OF CHRIST SET PLAINLY BEFORE YOUR EYES, TO RESORT NOW TO CIRCUMCISION! THINK ONLY HOW IT WAS THAT YOU RECEIVED THE SPIRIT: WAS IT BY OBEDIENCE TO LAW OR BY LISTENING IN FAITH? CAN YOU COMPLETE A SPIRITUAL WORK BY AN ORDINANCE OF THE FLESH? DID YOU SUFFER ALL THAT PERSECUTION FOR NOTHING? WAS IT YOUR OBEDIENCE TO LAW OR YOUR LISTENING IN FAITH THAT LED TO GOD'S IMPARTING TO YOU THE SPIRIT WITH POWER, EVEN AS THE FAITH OF ABRAHAM WAS RECKONED TO HIM FOR RIGHTEOUSNESS?—Ver. 1. **ἐβάσκανεν.** This word denoted either the fascination of an evil eye or some malignant influence akin to it; the infatuation of some Galatians at this crisis is attributed to the baneful effect of some mysterious powers of evil.

The reading **ἐβάσκηνεν** has probably found its way into some MSS. from classical usage; most verbs in **-αίνειν** form the aorist in **ᾰνα** in the N.T., *e.g.*, **λευκᾶναι ἐσήμανεν ποιμάνατε.**

The additions **τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι** after **ἐβάσκανεν,** and **ἐν ὑμῖν** after **προεγράφη** in the Received Text are evidently

III. 1. Ὦ ἀνόητοι Γαλάται, τίς ὑμᾶς ἐβάσκανεν,[1] οἷς κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς προεγράφη[2] ἐσταυρωμένος; 2. τοῦτο μόνον θέλω μαθεῖν ἀφ' ὑμῶν· Ἐξ ἔργων νόμου τὸ πνεῦμα ἐλάβετε, ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως; 3. οὕτως ἀνόητοί ἐστε; ἐναρξάμενοι πνεύματι, νῦν σαρκὶ ἐπιτελεῖσθε; 4. τοσαῦτα ἐπάθετε εἰκῇ; εἴ γε καὶ εἰκῇ. 5. ὁ οὖν ἐπιχορηγῶν ὑμῖν τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν,

[1] τῃ αληθειᾳ μη πειθεσθαι after εβασκανεν CD³EKLP; om. ℵABD¹FG 17, 67.
[2] εν υμιν after προεγραφη DEFGKLP; om. ℵABC 17, etc.

spurious. The former is probably due to a reminiscence of v. 7, where the clause occurs.—**προεγράφη.** This word is twice employed by the Apostle, once in Rom. xv. 4 with reference to the Scriptures, once in Eph. iii. 3 with reference to a former letter of his own. Here, probably, it refers in like manner to some document which he had placed in the hands of the Galatians, or some letter he had written for their guidance during his absence, in which the vital truth of the crucifixion had been enforced. That he wrote many apostolic letters to his converts is clear from 2 Thess. iii. 17. The addition **κατ' ὀφθάλμους** is in harmony with this view. **γράφειν** never has the sense of painting in the N.T.—**ἐσταυρωμένος.** The Greek order of words indicates that this participle has the force of a predicate. The fact of the Crucifixion with all that the fact involved was the truth which had been so distinctly set before the eyes of the Galatians in black and white.

Ver. 2. The Apostle appeals with confidence to the personal experience of his converts. They were themselves conscious of having received on their conversion gifts of the Spirit. Whence then came the inward change? Was it the result of fulfilling law, or of listening in faith? The question needs no answer: for it was obviously the result of listening in faith. The second clause couples together two essential requisites for conversion: men must not only listen, but listen in a right spirit, desiring to know and do God's will. The genitive **πίστεως** adds this essential condition.—**τὸ πνεῦμα.** *The spirit* constitutes in this Epistle a definite element in the regenerate nature, due to spiritual creation as the flesh is to natural creation—an internal organ by which the Holy Spirit operates on the will and prompts the action of man (*cf.* v. 16-22). It becomes therefore a living human force within the heart, distinct from the personality of the Holy Spirit. But on the other hand it is absolutely dependent for its vital force on the original inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and can neither live nor grow without continual nourishment and sustenance from Him.

Ver. 3. **πνεύματι . . . σαρκὶ.** These two datives denote the two internal spheres susceptible of moral influence. Conversion had brought about a spiritual change as its immediate result: it was folly to look for a consummation of this change from an ordinance of the flesh like circumcision. This was to exalt flesh above spirit instead of rising from flesh to spirit.—**ἐνάρχεσθαι** and **ἐπιτελεῖν** are coupled together in 2 Cor. viii. 6 and Phil. i. 6 to express the beginning and consummation of works of mercy and sanctification. Greek authors use **ἐνάρχεσθαι** with reference to the initial ceremony of a sacrifice (Eur., *Iph.*, A. 147, 435, 955), **ἐπιτελεῖν** in Heb. ix. 6 refers to the performance of ritual. The middle voice **ἐπιτελεῖσθε** is used here because the spiritual process is to be wrought by them upon themselves.

Ver. 4. The persecutions endured by the Galatian converts had all been due to the jealous animosity of the Jews: if they were now to accept the Law after all, they would proclaim their former resistance to have been wanton caprice on their part, which had led them to provoke persecution to no purpose (**εἰκῇ**) without any sufficient object.

Ver. 5. **ἐπιχορηγῶν.** The verb **χορηγεῖν** acquired its meaning from the function of the **χορηγός** whose duty it was to supply the members of his chorus with all necessary equipment in the course of their training and performance. As men took pride in the liberal fulfilment of this duty, the word came to denote a liberal supply. The compound **ἐπιχορηγεῖν** denotes apparently an enhancement of this bounty (2 Cor. ix. 10).—**δυνάμεις.** This word is sometimes applied in the Gospels to visible miracles, but in the language of Paul, as elsewhere, it denotes

ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως; 6. καθὼς Ἀβραὰμ ἐπίστευσε τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. 7. γινώσκετε ἄρα ὅτι οἱ ἐκ πίστεως, οὗτοί εἰσιν υἱοὶ Ἀβραάμ. 8. προϊδοῦσα δὲ ἡ γραφὴ ὅτι ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοῖ τὰ ἔθνη ὁ Θεὸς, προευηγγελίσατο τῷ Ἀβραὰμ, ὅτι Ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. 9. ὥστε οἱ ἐκ πίστεως εὐλογοῦνται σὺν τῷ πιστῷ Ἀβραάμ. 10. ὅσοι

forces or powers. Here accordingly it refers to the supernatural powers imparted by the Spirit to Christians.

Ver. 6. The faith of the Galatians is likened to that of Abraham, in that it found the same acceptance with God.

The quotation of Gen. xv. 6 *was reckoned* follows the LXX, whereas our version, following the Hebrew text, refers to God, *he counted it*. This passage is repeatedly commented on by Philo as well as in the N.T. Paul bases his argument upon it in Rom. iv. 3 by way of proof that God imputes righteousness on the ground of faith, not of works, and James guards it against misinterpretation by teachers who degraded faith into a barren assent of the intellect (James ii. 17-23). Obviously Jewish teachers had already concentrated attention on this passage on account of the explicit testimony which it bears to the faith of Abraham and to God's acceptance of that faith; and stress had been laid upon its authority in their schools of theology.

Vv. 7-14. By Faith men become sons of Abraham and inherit his blessing, whereas those who claim it on the score of obedience to Law are subject to the curse of a broken Law; from which Christ redeemed us, Gentiles as well as Jews, by bearing the curse Himself.—Ver. 7. **Γινώσκετε**: *Ye perceive*. The emphatic admonition, *Know ye*, adopted in our versions, would require an aorist imperative **γνῶτε**, as in Heb. viii. 11. This verse contains a deduction from the former, as is suggested by the inferential **ἄρα**. Since faith was the ground of Abraham's justification, it follows that those who inherit his faith are his true sons.—**οἱ ἐκ πίστεως**, *sc.* **υἱοὶ ὄντες**. The form of the Greek sentence suggests the insertion of these words to complete the ellipsis. With this addition the verse carries on the previous argument to its natural sequel. The faith of Abraham was there declared to be a fundamental condition of the divine acceptance. Those therefore who inherit his faith are his sons indeed and heirs of his blessing. The discourse of Christ recorded in the Gospel follows the same line of argument: *If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham* (John viii. 39). Both alike urge that resemblance in life and character is the true test of sonship. Gentiles therefore who prove themselves sons of Abraham by exhibiting like faith are his sons indeed, and inherit the blessing promised to his seed. The antithesis in ver. 10, **ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσίν**, *sc.* **υἱοί**, presents a like ellipsis: the exclusive claim of Jews to be sons of Abraham in virtue of their observance of the Law is there disposed of on corresponding grounds.

Ver. 8. **δικαιοῖ**: *justifieth*. The present tense is used because justification by faith, though not revealed to the Gentiles till Christ came, was an eternal truth of God's dealings with man, to be revealed in due time. There were in Genesis anticipations of this truth, and Abraham himself, the father of the faithful, was a kind of firstfruits of the Gentiles (Rom. iv. 10-12). The quotation here given contains the substance of promises recorded in Gen. xii. 3, and xviii. 18 with slight verbal alteration. These were *an* earlier Gospel, but not (as our versions intimate) *the* Gospel.

Ver. 9. **οἱ ἐκ πίστεως**. See note on ver. 7.

Ver. 10. The Apostle here proceeds to deal with the rival claim to a special blessing on the score of obedience to Law. Jews maintained that their knowledge of the Law entitled them to the blessings attached to the sons of Abraham. He urges on the contrary that this entailed on them the curse of a broken Law: for no flesh could keep the whole Law (*cf.* ii. 16). The failure of men to satisfy the requirements of the Law is not limited to the Mosaic Law, but is incidental to the idea of righteous Law in the abstract. Hence the expression **νόμου** rather than **τοῦ νόμου**. The Roman Epistle accordingly pronounces sentence of guilt on the Gentile as well as the Jewish world for breach of the Laws of natural or revealed religion. Here, however, the object is to meet claims founded on the Mosaic Law, so the curses of that

γὰρ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσὶν, ὑπὸ κατάραν εἰσί· γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι[1] Ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὃς οὐκ ἐμμένει ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου, τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτά. 11. ὅτι δὲ ἐν νόμῳ οὐδεὶς δικαιοῦται παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ, δῆλον· ὅτι Ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται· 12. ὁ δὲ νόμος οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ πίστεως, ἀλλ' Ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ[2] ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς. 13. Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου, γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα· (γέγραπται γὰρ, Ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὁ κρεμάμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου·) 14. ἵνα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἡ εὐλογία τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ γένηται

[1] οτι ℵABCDEFGP 17, etc.; om. KL.

[2] ανθρωπος after αυτα D^3EKL; om. ℵABCD¹FGP 17, etc.

Law are adduced in support of the argument. The imprecation here given is not a verbal quotation, but reproduces in substance the series of curses pronounced from Mount Ebal (Deut. xxvii. 15-26), summing them up in a single sentence.

Vv. 11, 12. The failure of the Law to justify is further established by a comparison of Habakkuk ii. 4 with Lev. xviii. 5: the latter embodies the spirit of the Law: for it demands obedience as a necessary condition antecedent to the gift of life from God (*cf.* Rom. x. 5). The prophet on the contrary makes life dependent upon faith. By thus substituting faith for obedience he virtually supersedes the existing Law, and establishes a new criterion, which takes account of the state of heart instead of the outward life (*cf.* Rom. i. 17). The same passage is adduced in Heb. x. 38 in proof of the vital importance of faith. All three writers agree in basing true religion upon heartfelt trust in God: but whereas the Epistle to the Hebrews regards faith from the same standpoint as the Hebrew prophet, and identifies it with the steadfast loyalty to an unseen God which supports the believer under manifold trials, Paul here limits his view to the faith which prompts the convert to embrace Christ. Regarding it therefore from a purely Christian standpoint, he embodies in his conception the new revelation of the Father's character made in Christ. The faith which he has in mind is justifying faith, the faith in God's pitying love which assures a repentant sinner of forgiveness and merciful acceptance in spite of a guilty past.

Ver. 13. The Law pronounced a blessing and a curse; but since it made no allowance for human infirmity, the blessing proved barren in result; while the curse, which invoked the just wrath of an offended God for the punishment of the guilty, proved, on the contrary, fruitful in condemnation.

From this hopeless state of just condemnation Christ delivered us by revealing the infinite mercy of an Almighty Father, and so reviving hope and thankful love in the heart of the condemned sinner by faith in His love.—**ἐξηγόρασεν.** The figure of a ransom, which this word conveys, is doubly appropriate in this connection. Men needed a ransom, for the Law had left them prisoners under sentence of death, and Christ had Himself to pay the price. He had to become a man like His brethren save in sin, and to endure the penalty denounced on malefactors and hang on the accursed cross, as if He had been guilty like them.—**γενόμενος κατάρα.** Hebrew thought tended to identify the man on whom a curse was laid with the curse, as it identified the sin-offering with the sin, calling it **ἁμαρτία** (Lev. iv. 21-25). Hence the scapegoat was regarded as utterly unclean by reason of the sins laid upon it. —**Ἐπικατάρατος . . .** This passage is quoted from Deut. xxi. 23 with one significant alteration. In the original the criminal executed under sentence of the Law is pronounced **κεκαταραμένος ὑπὸ Θεοῦ,** so that the Law is affirmed to be the voice of God, carrying with it the fulness of divine sanction. But here the words **ὑπὸ Θεοῦ** are omitted, inasmuch as the new revelation of God's mercy in Christ has superseded for Christians the previous condemnation of the Law.

The original passage refers to criminals executed under the Jewish Law, and commands the speedy burial of their dead bodies before sunset in opposition to the vindictive practices prevailing in Palestine among the surrounding nations

ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος λάβωμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως. 15. Ἀδελφοί, κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω, ὅμως ἀνθρώπου κεκυρωμένην διαθήκην οὐδεὶς ἀθετεῖ ἢ ἐπιδιατάσσεται. 16. τῷ δὲ Ἀβραὰμ ἐρρέθησαν αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι, καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ· οὐ λέγει, Καὶ τοῖς σπέρμασιν, ὡς ἐπὶ πολλῶν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐφ' ἑνός, Καὶ

of nailing up unburied bodies in public places (*cf.* 1 Sam. xxxi. 10, 2 Sam. xxi. 10). It made, of course, no reference to crucifixion, which was a Roman mode of execution, not a Jewish.

Ver. 14. **ἵνα . . . ἵνα . . .** Two gracious purposes of the Redeemer are here coupled together: (1) the extension of the blessing to Gentiles as well as Jews; (2) the outpouring of the Spirit upon those that embraced the faith of Christ.

Vv. 15-18. GOD'S WORD WAS PLIGHTED TO ABRAHAM THAT HE WOULD BESTOW THE INHERITANCE ON HIS SEED (NOT ON ALL HIS DESCENDANTS, BUT ON ONE PARTICULAR SEED), AND COULD NOT THEREFORE BE SET ASIDE BY SUBSEQUENT STIPULATIONS IN THE LAW.—Ver. 15. **κ. ἄνθρωπον λέγω.** This preface indicates that the argument which it introduces is founded on the principles of human law and custom.—**διαθήκην.** The meaning *testament* affixed to this word in classical Greek belongs to the Greek practice of testamentary disposition, other covenants being designated by **συνθήκη**, etc. But no such law or custom existed among the ancient Hebrews, so the LXX employed the word to express the Hebrew conception of a *covenant* between God and His people. As this was the outcome of God's sovereign grace and bounty, and not a matter of mutual arrangement, it could hardly be described by any of the Greek terms for *covenant;* it was, on the other hand, analogous to a disposition of property by testament, and was accordingly designated by the term **διαθήκη.** Thence it was extended also to covenants between man and man in the LXX. The same sense of covenant is attached to the word apparently throughout the N.T. Here, at all events, the distinct reference to the covenant with Abraham leaves no doubt of its meaning.—**ὅμως ἀνθρώπου.** This phrase (= **καίπερ ἀνθρώπου οὖσαν ὅμως**) intimates that even men are bound by a contract duly ratified: *a fortiori*, God is bound by His plighted word. Two distinct methods of superseding a contract are suggested by **ἀθετεῖ** and **ἐπιδιατάσσεται**: it might be expressly annulled, or it might be overlaid by new stipulations.

Ver. 16. The clause **καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ** is quoted from God's promises to Abraham in Gen. xiii. 15 and xvii. 8 with only the necessary change of the second person **σου** into **αὐτοῦ.** The original promise was limited to the possession of the promised land, but was coupled with a perpetual covenant between God and the seed of Abraham: *I will be their God, Thou shalt keep my covenant, thou and thy seed after thee in their generations.* Hence Hebrew prophecy imported into it the idea of a spiritual inheritance, and the Epistle adopts this interpretation without hesitation.—**οὐ λέγει,** *sc.* **ὁ Θεός.** As the clause in question was quoted from an utterance of God, it was not necessary to specify the subject of **λέγει.**—**καὶ τοῖς σπέρμασιν**: *And to his seeds, i.e.*, families. This contrast between the many families and the one chosen family is more than mere verbal criticism: it contains the germ of that doctrine of continuous divine election within the stock of Abraham which is developed in the ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. For Abraham had many children after the flesh; and the exclusion of Ishmael, Dedan, Midian, Esau in patriarchal times in favour of Isaac and of Jacob established the principle which culminated in the rejection of the Jewish nation in favour of Christ. This conception of a continuous holy family linking Christ with Abraham runs through the next section of the Epistle; just as **πολλῶν** and **ἑνός** here mean **π. σπερμάτων** and **ἑ. σπέρματος,** so **ἑνός** in ver. 20 means **ἑνὸς σπέρματος** and **τὰ πάντα** in ver. 22 **τὰ πάντα σπέρματα.** In like manner Christ is contemplated, not by Himself alone as constituting in the unity of His person the chosen seed, but as a new centre out of whom the family of God branched forth afresh. He became in a far higher sense than Isaac or Jacob a new head of the chosen family: for all Abraham's children after the flesh that received Him not were shut out from the blessing, while all who believed in Him became by faith sons of Abraham and members of the true family of God. The whole Church of Christ are in short regarded as one with Christ—one in life

τῷ σπέρματί σου, ὅς ἐστι Χριστός. 17. τοῦτο δὲ λέγω, διαθήκην προκεκυρωμένην ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ[1] ὁ μετὰ ἔτη τετρακόσια καὶ τριάκοντα γεγονὼς νόμος οὐκ ἀκυροῖ, εἰς τὸ καταργῆσαι τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν. 18. εἰ γὰρ ἐκ νόμου ἡ κληρονομία, οὐκ ἔτι ἐξ ἐπαγγελίας· τῷ δὲ Ἀβραὰμ δι' ἐπαγγελίας κεχάρισται ὁ Θεός. 19. Τί οὖν ὁ νόμος; τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν προσετέθη,[2] ἄχρις οὗ ἔλθῃ τὸ σπέρμα ᾧ ἐπήγγελται,

[1] εις Χριστον after Θεου DEFGKL; om. ℵABCP 17, etc.
[2] προσετεθη ℵABD³EKL; ετεθη D¹FG 71, etc.

and spirit, for they are members of His body and partake of His spirit (*cf.* vv. 28, 29).

Vv. 17, 18. The inviolate sanctity of God's earlier covenant in presence of the subsequent promulgation of the Law is here affirmed in virtue of the principle established in ver. 15. Had the inheritance been made contingent on obedience to Law, the previous promise would have been thereby invalidated.

The Received Text inserts **εἰς Χριστόν** after **Θεοῦ**. The words appear from the MS. evidence to be a later addition to the text, suggested probably by the previous argument, which associated the promise to Abraham with the coming of Christ, in whom alone that promise finds its fulfilment. The very form of the sentence forbids the acceptance of the addition here: for **διαθήκην** in the absence of an article does not denote the particular covenant concluded with Abraham, but signifies any covenant in the abstract, if duly ratified by God, whatever its nature.—**δι' ἐπαγγ. κεχάρισται.** The full bearing of the language on the argument can hardly be expressed in English without a paraphrase. **χαρίζεσθαι** denotes not merely a gift, but a free gift bestowed by the grace of God without reserve, and **ἐπαγγελία** marks the promise as a spontaneous offer, and not an undertaking (**ὑπόσχεσις**) based on terms of mutual agreement.

Vv. 19-22. THE LAW WAS A TEMPORARY ENACTMENT ORDAINED TO DEAL WITH THE OFFENCES WHICH IT DENOUNCES UNTIL THE COMING OF THE PROMISED SEED. THE GOD FROM WHOM IT PROCEEDED WAS THE GOD OF ABRAHAM, BUT HE PROMULGATED IT THROUGH ANGELS AND AN APPOINTED MEDIATOR TO ALL THE CHILDREN OF ABRAHAM AFTER THE FLESH, NOT TO THE ONE CHOSEN SEED. DID IT THEN CONTRAVENE HIS PROMISES? NAY VERILY. IF INDEED IT HAD BEEN CAPABLE OF QUICKENING LIFE, IT WOULD HAVE PROVIDED NEW MEANS OF JUSTIFICATION: BUT WHAT IT REALLY DID WAS TO CONVICT ALL ALIKE OF SIN, THAT THE PROMISE MIGHT BE GIVEN TO THOSE WHO BELIEVE ON FAITH IN CHRIST. —**Τί οὖν ὁ νόμος.** What function then had the Law, if it had absolutely no effect on God's previous covenant with Abraham? — **τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν.** Our versions render this *because of transgressions*, ignoring the Greek article. But there could obviously be no transgressions until the Law existed, however grievous the moral degradation. The real meaning is that it was added with a view to *the* offences which it specifies, thereby pronouncing them to be from that time forward transgressions of the Law. Its design is gathered in short from its contents. The prohibitions of the Ten Commandments reveal their own purpose: they were enacted in order to repress the worship of false gods, idolatry, blasphemy, Sabbath breaking, disobedience to parents, murder, adultery, theft, false witness, covetousness. These sins prevailed before the Law, but by pronouncing them to be definite transgressions it called in the fear of God's wrath to reinforce the weakness of the moral sense and educate man's conscience. The same aspect of the Law is forcibly presented in 1 Tim. i. 9. *Law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and unruly. . . .* Attention is in both concentrated on the moral Law to the exclusion of the sacrificial and ceremonial.—**ἄχρις οὗ.** The alternative reading **ἄχρις ἄν** does not affect the sense. It is assumed on the strength of previous argument that the dispensation of the Law came to an end with the coming of Christ. By the gift of an indwelling spirit He emancipated His faithful disciples from allegiance to an outward Law.—**ἐπήγγελται**: *He* (*i.e.*, God) *hath promised* (*cf.* Rom. iv. 21, Heb. xii. 26). **ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι** never has a passive sense in the N.T.—**διαταγεὶς δι' ἀγγέλων.** The N.T. refers three times to the interposition of angels in

διαταγεὶς δι' ἀγγέλων, ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου· 20. ὁ δὲ μεσίτης ἑνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν, ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἷς ἐστίν. 21. Ὁ οὖν νόμος κατὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ[1]; μὴ γένοιτο. εἰ γὰρ ἐδόθη νόμος ὁ δυνάμενος ζωοποιῆσαι,

[1] του Θεου ℵACDEKLP; Θεου FG; om. B.

the promulgation of the Law: God's intercourse with Moses through the angel of His presence was evidently a common topic in Jewish schools of theology. In Acts vii. 53 the fact is recorded by way of enhancing the authority of the Law; in Heb. ii. 2 it is contrasted with God's revelation in His Son: here it is contrasted with God's more familiar intercourse with Abraham. He drew nigh to God, and *was called the friend of God:* but at Sinai the people stood far off, and the Law was made known through the double intervention of angels and of a human mediator.—**ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου.** The term **μεσίτης** was applied with the utmost latitude to any intermediate between two parties, whether it was the one great Mediator between God and man or any of the subordinate servants of God through whom He makes known His will to men or exercises His authority. The phrase **ἐν χειρί** defines its meaning here, for it implies that Moses was put in charge of the promulgation of the Law (*cf.* Numb. iv. 28, 37 in LXX), and was God's appointed agent for the purpose. This interposition of a mediator between God and the people was a marked feature of distinction between the Sinaitic and the patriarchal dispensation.

Ver. 20. The rendering of the first clause in our versions, *Now a mediator is not a mediator of one*, reduces it to an unmeaning truism. The author is not treating of mediators in the abstract, but writes of Moses the mediator of the Law that he was not mediator of one chosen family; and so contrasts God's revelation through him with the previous covenant. That covenant had been made with Abraham in person, and embraced a single chosen family (*cf.* ver. 16) restricted from generation to generation by continuous selection of God's elect until it centred in Christ Himself. Not so the covenant of Sinai: it was addressed, not to one family (**ἑνὸς,** *sc.* **σπέρματος**), but to many families of Abraham's children after the flesh. This change of recipients involved a vital change in the revelation also: whereas the promise had quickened faith by an appeal to gratitude and love, the Law used threats of wrath and punishment to deter corrupt and carnal natures from indulging the vices of the flesh.

The stress laid on the unity of the chosen seed in ver. 16 and the ellipsis of **σπέρματα** with **τὰ πάντα** in ver. 22 justify us in understanding **σπέρματος** here with **ἑνός.**—**ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἷς ἐστιν.** The recurrence of the same phrase **εἷς ὁ Θεός** with a corresponding force in Rom. iii. 30 suggests its true force and connection with the context in this place. The Apostle is there urging the real harmony of God's dealings with Jews and Gentiles, however different the method employed for justifying the two severally; and argues that it is nevertheless one and the same God who will justify both. So here after differentiating the revelation made through Moses from that to Abraham, he is careful to add that the God of Sinai is one with the God of Abraham, however distinct might be the two revelations. The true force of the clause may be expressed as follows, *but the God* (*sc.* the God of Sinai) *is one with the God of promise.* The twofold revelation of the name of God to Moses as the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and as the eternal God *I am that I am*, suggests the same thought of the divine unity in spite of the various aspects in which God reveals Himself to successive generations of men.

Ver. 21. In view of the continuity of divine providence the suggestion that the Law contravened or nullified the previous covenant of God with Abraham and the patriarchs is dismissed as monstrous. It was incompatible with the faithfulness of God to His pledged word, and is therefore repudiated with the customary formula **μὴ γένοιτο.** The apparent sanction given by the Law to a new method of justification (*viz.*, by works) could lead to no actual result, unless it had at the same time possessed the power which it lacked of quickening spiritual life.—**τοῦ Θεοῦ.** These words are omitted in some MSS., but the preponderance of authority is in favour of their retention. The sense is the same whether they be expressed or understood. The addition may perhaps be due to a marginal comment which found its way into the text.

Ver. 22. The real function of the Law was not to justify but to convict of sin, that men might the more readily turn in humble faith to Christ for relief from the

ὄντως ἐκ νόμου ἦν ἂν[1] ἡ δικαιοσύνη· 22. ἀλλὰ συνέκλεισεν ἡ γραφὴ τὰ πάντα ὑπὸ ἁμαρτίαν, ἵνα ἡ ἐπαγγελία ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοθῇ τοῖς πιστεύουσι. 23. Πρὸ τοῦ δὲ ἐλθεῖν τὴν πίστιν, ὑπὸ νόμον ἐφρουρούμεθα συγκλειόμενοι[2] εἰς τὴν μέλλουσαν πίστιν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι· 24. ὥστε ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς Χριστόν, ἵνα

[1] εκ νομου την αν ℵABC 3, etc.; om. την αν FG; αν εκ νομου την D^3EKLP.
[2] συνκλειομενοι ℵABD¹FGP 17, etc.; συνκεκλεισμενοι CD^3EKL.

burden of an accusing conscience.—**ἡ γραφὴ.** The Old Testament was always designated by the plural **γραφαί** in apostolic times, for the several books were preserved in separate rolls and did not form a single whole. Here, therefore, **ἡ γραφή** points to some particular passage of the Law to which the author has already drawn attention as embodying its spirit. The passage of Deut. xxvii. 26 quoted in ver. 10 answers this description, for it imprecates a curse on all who fell short of perfect obedience.—**συνέκλεισεν . . . τὰ πάντα.** The figure here presented of prisoners under sentence, condemned to pay the penalty of sin, makes it clear that the object of **συνέκλεισεν** is *persons*, not things: and accordingly these prisoners are described in ver. 23 as **συγκλειόμενοι** (masc.). A neuter plural substantive must therefore be understood with **τὰ πάντα** which is applicable to persons. Hence I infer that by **τὰ πάντα** is meant **τὰ πάντα σπέρματα,** *i.e.*, all the families of Abraham after the flesh, in other words the whole Jewish nation.—**ἵνα . . .** The design of the Law was to pave the way for the eventual fulfilment of the promise to all that believe by faith in Christ.

Vv. 23, 24. THE POSITION OF THE TRUE CHILDREN OF GOD BEFORE THE COMING OF CHRIST IS ILLUSTRATED BY THE CONTROL EXERCISED OVER CHILDREN IN THEIR FATHER'S HOUSE BY MEMBERS OF HIS HOUSEHOLD. These verses explain the position of the faithful under the Law. They are here associated with Christians by the use of the first person plural; for they too were in their generation believers in God, they belonged to the same blessed family and inherited the original promise. Yet since all Israel from the time of Moses to the Advent were subjected to the control of the Law, they too were subject to bondage. But this was really due to the watchful love of their Heavenly Father, who thus provided needful shelter and guidance, just as an earthly father places his young children during years of weakness and inexperience under the charge of household servants.—**τὴν πίστιν.** The article, though ignored in our versions, is essential to the sense. By the coming of *the* faith is meant the historic fact of the Christian religion, the spread of the Gospel on earth. The term has the same objective sense as in i. 23, iii. 25, Acts vi. 7, and Rom. iii. 30, where also a clear distinction is drawn between **πίστεως,** faith in the abstract, and **τῆς πίστεως,** *the* faith of Christ. Obviously faith did not come with Christ, it was the most conspicuous virtue of the Jewish Church, and Abraham was but the first of many splendid examples of it.—**συγκλειόμενοι.** MS. authority is strongly in favour of the present participle, which is also more appropriate than the perfect **συγκεκλεισμένοι** for describing the continuous process of legal condemnation which prevailed from generation to generation.—**παιδαγωγὸς.** No English equivalent for this term can convey its real force, for it has no exact counterpart in an English home. The position of a nurse towards young children approaches more nearly than that of schoolmaster or tutor to the office of the **παιδαγωγός,** for he was a confidential dependent, usually a slave, neither qualified to instruct, nor invested with authority to control his young master, but appointed to attend on him, to safeguard him, and to report to his father any disorderly or immoral habits on which it might be necessary for the father to place a check. The Law in like manner regulated outward habits, enforced order and decency, and maintained a certain standard of morality among Israelites until in due time they became ripe for spiritual freedom. It was not the function of the Law to address itself directly to the conscience like the Prophets, or to claim spiritual authority over the whole man, but to impose a check on the open tyranny of evil, to enforce on the community a higher standard of morals, and so to foster indirectly the growth of spiritual life.

Vv. 25-29. BUT NOW WE ARE NO LONGER CHILDREN. YE ARE ALL SONS.

ἐκ πίστεως δικαιωθῶμεν· 25. ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς πίστεως, οὐκ ἔτι ὑπὸ παιδαγωγόν ἐσμεν. 26. πάντες γὰρ υἱοὶ Θεοῦ ἐστὲ διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ· 27. ὅσοι γὰρ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε. 28. οὐκ ἔνι Ἰουδαῖος, οὐδὲ Ἕλλην· οὐκ ἔνι δοῦλος, οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερος· οὐκ ἔνι ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ· πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἷς ἐστὲ

OF GOD: AT YOUR BAPTISM YE PUT ON CHRIST, AND WERE INVESTED WITH SPIRITUAL MANHOOD: ALL PREVIOUS DISTINCTIONS OF CREED OR RACE, OF POSITION OR NATURE, WERE DONE AWAY: YE ARE ALL ONE IN CHRIST.—The sudden change from the first to the second person plural betokens an extension in the point of view from Israel to the Gentile world. The Epistle has been dealing since iii. 17 with the position of Israelites under the Law before the Advent of the Christ. But that event brought Gentiles also within the scope of God's revealed promises and of His blessings in Christ. So the Apostle turns to his converts, largely enlisted out of Gentiles, with the assurance, "Ye are all sons of God, whatever your antecedents". Their adoption is assumed, as their possession of the gifts of the Spirit is assumed in iii. 2. The spirit of adoption, of which they were conscious within their hearts, assured them that they were sons of God (*cf.* Rom. viii. 15, 16).

Ver 27. **ἐνεδύσασθε.** The conception of spiritual manhood is here associated with baptism by a figure borrowed from Greek and Roman usage. At a certain age the Roman youth exchanged the *toga praetexta* for the *toga virilis* and passed into the rank of citizens. So the Christian had been invested at his baptism with the robe of spiritual manhood. Whereas he had before been under the control of rules and regulations, like a child in his father's house, he possessed now the independence of a grown up son. This figure of clothing is applied in various ways in Scripture: the effects of death and resurrection are described in 2 Cor. v. 4 by the figure of *unclothing* and *reclothing*: the figures of *putting on Christ* and *putting on armour* are used in Rom. xiii. 12, 14, Eph. vi. 11 to express the new life support and strength required for our Christian warfare. The exact force of the figure depends in every case upon the context. Here the author evidently has in mind the change of dress which marked the transition from boyhood to manhood. Greeks and Romans made much of this occasion and celebrated the investment of a youth with man's dress by family gatherings and religious rites. The youth, hitherto subject to domestic rule, was then admitted to the rights and responsibilities of a citizen, and took his place beside his father in the councils of the family.

Baptism is in fact likened to a spiritual coming of age: the convert, who had hitherto been bound to obey definite commandments and fulfil definite duties, was now set free to learn God's will from the inward voice of the Spirit, and discharge the heavier obligations incumbent on a citizen of the heavenly commonwealth under the guidance of an enlightened conscience. He had entered on his spiritual manhood, and was accordingly emancipated from his earlier bondage to an outward Law.

There is an obvious correspondence between this figure of *putting on Christ* at baptism, and the ceremony which prevailed throughout the Church in subsequent centuries of investing catechumens with white robes on the occasion of their baptism. Both give expression to a kindred thought: some of the Fathers associate them together, and perhaps the language of the Apostle contributed to the spread of the ceremonial. The symbolism however differed materially: the white robes corresponded rather to the wedding garment in the parable: they were an emblem of purity and signified the cleansing effect of baptism, whereas the context of the Epistle points to enfranchisement and emancipation from control.

Ver. 28. 'Having now established the temporary and subordinate function of the Law, the Apostle finally repudiates every claim, whether on that or any other ground, on behalf of any distinct class to superior sanctity in Christ. All Christians, whatever their antecedents, are one in Christ.—**οὐκ ἔνι.** Distinctions of creed or race are incompatible with true membership of Christ: the legal barriers and social cleft which severed freeman from slave, even natural divisions as deep-seated as those of sex, disappear in presence of the all-absorbing unity of the body of Christ. **ἔνι** is a strengthened form of **ἐν** used for **ἔνεστιν**, as **πάρα, πέρι,**

ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ· 29. εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ, ἄρα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ σπέρμα ἐστέ,[1] κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν κληρονόμοι. IV. 1. Λέγω δέ, Ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ὁ κληρονόμος νήπιός ἐστιν, οὐδὲν διαφέρει δούλου, κύριος πάντων ὤν· 2. ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ ἐπιτρόπους ἐστὶ καὶ οἰκονόμους, ἄχρι τῆς προθεσμίας τοῦ πατρός. 3. οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς, ὅτε ἦμεν νήπιοι ὑπὸ τὰ

[1] εστε και FGKLP; om. και ℵABCDE 17, etc.

μέτα are for πάρεστιν, περιέστιν, μέτεστιν.—**ὑμεῖς.** Special stress is laid on this pronoun by its insertion with **πάντες**: the Galatians were themselves a signal instance of the power of the Gospel to make men one in Christ: for their Churches were gathered out of the most diverse elements: Jew and Gentile, slave and freeman, male and female, had all contributed to their composition.

Ver. 29. **ὑμεῖς.** The emphatic insertion of **ὑμεῖς** before **Χριστοῦ** in preference to **Χριστοῦ ἐστέ** lays stress apparently on the wonderful transformation of men who had been aliens from the people of God into members of Christ.

CHAPTER IV.—VV. 1-7. THERE WERE IN THE GENTILE WORLD ALSO BEFORE CHRIST CHILDREN OF GOD IN BONDAGE TO HUMAN RULE, THAT KNEW NOT THE UNSEEN FATHER IN HEAVEN WHO WAS ORDERING THEIR LIVES. THEY WERE LIKE ORPHAN CHILDREN, WHOM A DEPARTED FATHER HAS WITH LOVING CARE CONSIGNED DURING CHILDHOOD TO THE CHARGE OF GUARDIANS AND STEWARDS. IN DUE TIME, HOWEVER, GOD SENT FORTH HIS SON TO REDEEM THEM ALSO FROM BONDAGE, AND HAS MADE US SONS AND HEIRS, SENDING FORTH THE SPIRIT OF HIS SON INTO OUR HEARTS.—In dealing with the relation of the Mosaic Law to the antecedent covenant and with its subsequent fulfilment in Christ, the Apostle necessarily limited his view of the seed of Abraham, who were covenanted heirs of salvation between Moses and the Advent, to Israel. He likened these accordingly to children growing up in their father's house under domestic control. But as most of those to whom he wrote had been converts from heathenism, he now extends his view of the world before Christ so as to embrace Gentiles also within its scope. Amidst the heathen were other children of God, a faithful seed, potential heirs of salvation, who passed through a like stage of spiritual childhood under different conditions. They were like orphan children committed by the watchful care of an unseen and unknown father to the custody of others. For they were subject to human systems of religion, government and law, neither knowing their Heavenly Father nor comprehending His love for them. The conception of a dead father providing by his will for the due education of his orphan children serves admirably to illustrate the mutual relations between God and the Gentile world, and to set forth the combination of steadfast love on one side with utter ignorance on the other. The illustration is obviously borrowed from testamentary systems prevailing among Greeks and Romans (not among Hebrews) which enabled a father to appoint guardians for his orphan children during their minority. These testamentary powers differed considerably in different parts of the Roman world according to the municipal laws of various cities. Whereas Roman citizens became wards of the state at fourteen, so that the powers of testamentary guardians were strictly limited, the discretion of the father was allowed a wider range in Greek cities. At Athens, for instance, the guardians of Demosthenes retained control over his property till he became a full citizen after eighteen; and in Asiatic Greece the custody of property was sometimes prolonged to twenty-five, though the personal authority ceased at fourteen. The dependent position of an orphan is described in popular language without legal precision; **νήπιος** is not a legal term, but an appropriate description for a child of tender years, naturally subject to the control of guardians (**ἐπιτρόπους**) and subordinate agents whom they might employ for household management or care of property (**οἰκονόμους**). It can hardly be right to identify the latter with the Roman *curatores*, for the special function of these officers was custody of property and not personal.

Ver. 3. **νήπιοι**: *children*, *i.e.*, spiritually children. The clause points to the stage of undeveloped spiritual life through which converts from heathenism had passed, the spiritual childhood which had been the lot of earlier generations be-

στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἦμεν δεδουλωμένοι· 4. ὅτε δὲ ἦλθε τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικὸς, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον, 5. ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ, ἵνα τὴν υἱοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν. 6. ὅτι δέ ἐστε υἱοὶ, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν,[1] κράζον, Ἀββᾶ, ὁ πατήρ. 7. ὥστε οὐκ ἔτι εἶ δοῦλος, ἀλλ' υἱός· εἰ δὲ υἱὸς, καὶ κληρονόμος διὰ Θεοῦ.[2] 8. Ἀλλὰ τότε μὲν, οὐκ εἰδότες Θεὸν, ἐδου-

[1] ημων ℵABCD¹FGP; υμων D³EKL.
[2] δια Θεου ℵABC¹ 17; δια Θεον FG; Θεου δια Χριστου ℵᶜC³DEKLP.

fore the time was ripe for the Advent.—**στοιχεῖα.** The association of this word with **νήπιοι** fixes on it the conception of a rudimentary training to which the world was subjected during its spiritual infancy by way of preparation for the Gospel of Christ and the dispensation of the Spirit. Before men could enter into the spirit of His teaching, they had to learn the elementary principles of religion and morality. Compulsory obedience to definite rules of justice and order was a necessary preparation for the freedom of the Spirit. This preliminary education was given to the Hebrews in the Ten Commandments and the Law, it was imparted to a wider world in Greek civilisation and philosophy, in Roman law and government, and in other forms of national and social life. These rudiments are disparaged in ver. 9 as *weak and beggarly* in comparison with the teaching of the Spirit, for Christian men ought to have outgrown their spiritual childhood. So, again, in Col. ii. 8, 20, they are condemned wherever their traditional hold on human society produces an antagonism to the higher teaching of Christ. But before the Advent they formed a valuable discipline for the education of the world.

Ver. 4. When God saw that the world was ripe for the Advent, He sent forth His Son. Until generations of mankind had learnt through years of social training to control some of the animal instincts of their lower nature, to rebel against its brutal passions, and cherish a desire to live in obedience to their higher nature, until they had developed some sense of sin and some craving after a holiness beyond their reach, they were not ready to welcome a Redeemer.—**γενόμενον . . . νόμον.** The incarnate Son of God took upon Him our nature and our duties. He was (1) born of woman, (2) made subject to Law. His subjection to Law is so expressly associated with the subjection of the world in general to Law that the term cannot be limited (as our versions limit it) to *the* Law of Moses. Christ was in fact subjected also to Roman Law, and died by its sentence.

Ver. 5. **ἵνα . . . ἵνα.** These two final clauses couple together two gracious purposes of God in the scheme of redemption, (1) the obliteration of a guilty past, (2) divine adoption with the blessings which sonship entails. The description *under Law* includes Gentiles as well as Jews: for though they had not *the Law*, they were not without Law to God (*cf.* Rom. ii. 14 . . .): they have indeed been expressly specified in iii. 14 as included in the redemption from the curse of the Law.—**ἀπολάβωμεν.** This verb denotes *receiving back*, as **ἀποδιδόναι** does *giving back* (*cf.* Luke xix. 8): accordingly it describes the adoption in Christ as a restoration of the original birthright, withheld throughout many generations for the sake of necessary discipline.

Ver. 6. Sonship involves relations of mutual confidence and love between the Father who bestows His choicest gifts, and the Son who responds with His whole heart.

Ver. 7. **διὰ Θεοῦ.** This language is unusual, and many variations are found in MSS. and versions, amidst them the Received Text **Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ,** but there can be little question on MS. evidence that the above is the genuine text. As for the true force of the words, the Epistle has now traced the scheme of redemption and design of bestowing a heavenly inheritance in Christ as far back as the patriarchs, and has shown that from the time of Abraham downwards God was disciplining Israel with a view to their becoming sons of God, and again that He was really ordering the lives of Gentiles likewise, though they knew Him not, with the same intent. With good reason therefore it is here said "through God—through His original

λεύσατε τοῖς φύσει μὴ[1] οὖσι θεοῖς· 9. νῦν δὲ, γνόντες Θεὸν, μᾶλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ Θεοῦ, πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα, οἷς πάλιν ἄνωθεν δουλεύειν θέλετε; 10. ἡμέρας παρατηρεῖσθε, καὶ μῆνας, καὶ καιροὺς, καὶ ἐνιαυτούς.

11. Φοβοῦμαι ὑμᾶς, μή πως εἰκῆ κεκοπίακα εἰς ὑμᾶς. 12. Γίνεσθε

[1] φυσει μη ℵABCD[1]EP; μη φυσει D[3]FGKL.

design and providential care—thou hast now become son and heir".

Vv. 8-10. BUT THOUGH IN TIME PAST WHEN YOU KNEW NOT GOD YOU WERE SLAVES TO FALSE GODS, HOW CAN YOU, NOW THAT YOU HAVE LEARNT TO KNOW HIM, OR RATHER HAVE BEEN RECOGNISED BY HIM, TURN BACK TO THE LESSONS OF CHILDHOOD AND CRAVE A BONDAGE TO TIMES AND SEASONS?—The guilt of past idolatry is palliated on the score of ignorance, in the same spirit as in Acts xvii. 30, in order to press home the responsibility of those who have learnt to know God (**γνόντες Θεόν**) in Christ. There was some excuse for their former bondage to imaginary gods who had no real existence: but how can they now turn back in heart to the weak and beggarly lessons of their spiritual childhood after they have received the spirit of sonship? Instead of ruling their own lives by reason and conscience under the guidance of the Spirit like men in Christ, they are bent on subjecting themselves like children to elementary rules of formal service.

Ver. 9. **μᾶλλον δὲ.** This correction is added, lest any should pride themselves on their knowledge of God, to warn them that it is not due to their own act, but to God who recognised them as His sons and revealed Himself to them. **ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ.** Hitherto the Apostle has spoken with respect of the education given to the world before Christ (iv. 1-3), bearing in mind the progress of the Greek and Roman world in social habits, institutions and laws: they had in fact learnt much in the sphere of morals and natural religion that would bear comparison with the progress of Israel under the light of the revealed Law of God. But when he compares the mechanical routine of formal observances which formed the staple of religion for the heathen and for many so-called religious Jews with the spiritual teaching of the Gospel, he does not hesitate to denounce them as weak and beggarly.

Ver. 10. The observance of Sabbaths and new moons, of feasts and fasts, of sabbatical and jubilee years, was clearly enjoined by the ceremonial Law; and Paul admitted the obligations of that Law for himself and for all the Circumcision. He continued to frequent the Sabbath-worship of the synagogue, attended the feasts, bound himself under voluntary vows. What he condemns is the adoption of these practices by baptised Gentiles: for this imputed to them an inherent sacredness incompatible with the true freedom of the Spirit.

Vv. 11-20. DISAPPOINTMENT OF THE APOSTLE AT THE CHANGED FEELING OF HIS CONVERTS; REMINISCENCES OF THE PAST; PATHETIC APPEAL TO OLD AFFECTION; PROTEST AGAINST PRESENT ESTRANGEMENT.—Ver. 12. Our versions abruptly sever the connection of this verse with the previous context, and do great violence to the Greek text in both clauses. They transpose the words **ἀδελφοὶ δέομαι ὑμῶν** from their true place at the end of the verse to the beginning, and render **γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ,** *Be ye as I am.* But this makes it = **γίνεσθε ὁποῖος ἐγώ εἰμι** (*cf.* Acts xxvi. 29), though it is impossible to understand **εἰμι** in the Greek text after **γίνεσθε.** The context points distinctly to **ἐγενόμην** as the proper supplement after **ὡς ἐγώ.** The last verse has carried back the author's thoughts to his original ministry, and he proceeds to revive the remembrance of that period. "Act as I did (he exclaims); deal with me as I dealt with you." Instead of a mere vague admonition to imitate his character he is holding up his actual conduct for an example to them, and proceeds to specify the particular occasion to which he refers.—**ὅτι κἀγὼ . . .:** *For I too beseech you as you, brethren, besought me.* It is an obvious error to detach **κἀγώ** from the following verb **δέομαι** and supply **εἰμι,** as is done in our versions. The Greek requires a verb to be supplied after **ὑμεῖς** corresponding to **κἀγὼ δέομαι ὑμῶν,** and I understand accordingly **ἐδεήθητέ μου.**

The Galatians could not fail to recollect the occasion to which these words refer; for it was the true birthday of their

ὡς ἐγὼ, ὅτι κἀγὼ ὡς ὑμεῖς, ἀδελφοὶ, δέομαι ὑμῶν. 13. οὐδέν με ἠδικήσατε· οἴδατε δὲ ὅτι δι' ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς εὐηγγελισάμην

Church, the memorable crisis when at the close of Paul's address the Jews departed from the synagogue, but the Gentiles besought him to repeat to them the words of life on the following Sabbath; after which many Jews and proselytes followed Paul and Barnabas persuading them to abide by the doctrine of the grace of God. (See Acts xiii. 42, 43. In the Greek text it is clear that the persuasion proceeded from them, and not from Paul and Barnabas.) The Galatians had then been suitors to Paul to maintain the freedom of the Gospel, he was now a suitor to them in his turn for its maintenance. —**οὐδέν με ἠδικήσατε**: *Ye had done me no wrong.* The force of this clause appears from what follows: Paul is dwelling on the mutual relations between him and the Galatians at the time of that memorable petition. They on their side had done him no wrong, they had not driven him away by persecution or illtreatment, yet up to that time (**τὸ πρότερον**) he had only been induced by illness to preach to them. The Galatians had, in short, given him no excuse for passing them by, as he intended to do, until he was attacked by an illness which left him no option.

Ver. 13. **δι' ἀσθένειαν.** This can only mean *owing to infirmity of the flesh, i.e.*, to illness. **διά** with accusative has the same causal force in the N.T. as in Attic Greek. A phrase like **διὰ νύκτα**, *by night*, is found in Homer, but **διά** subsequently lost its temporal force, and only regained it in the Latinised Greek of later centuries from confusion with the Latin *per*. The position of **δι' ἀσθένειαν** before the verb lays stress upon the fact that the ministry was due to illness alone, and not to spontaneous resolve.

It appears from this and the following verses that the illness occurred under the eyes of the Galatians, who watched its progress, were familiar with its repulsive symptoms, and displayed tender sympathy with the sufferer. They were aware also of the alteration it had made in his plans. The inference from these facts is clear, that he did not intend at the time of his arrival in Galatia to preach there at all, but was prostrated immediately after by sudden illness, and so forced to relinquish his previous project and abandon for the present any further journey. The only conceivable way, in short, in which an attack of illness in Galatia can have occasioned his preaching there was by involuntary detention. Here, accordingly, the motive for mentioning it is to show how little claim he had on the gratitude of the Galatians at that time, and how little he had deserved the tender sympathy which they exhibited. The historical connection of this illness with the ministry of Paul and Barnabas is investigated in the Introduction (pp. 135-7).

It has been suggested that this attack was perhaps identical with the **σκόλοψ τῇ σαρκί** mentioned in 2 Cor. xii. 7, and this may be true, but the real nature of the **σκόλοψ** is unknown. Some features of this attack on the contrary may be inferred from the description given of its effects: it incapacitated the patient for travel, produced disfigurement and offensive symptoms, but allowed free intercourse with those around him. His success in winning the hearts of those who visited him in his sick chamber suggests a chronic ailment prolonged for a considerable time, as does also the complete change in his plans. The only definite hint given of a specific malady is the language of ver. 15: from which I gather that the eyesight was imperilled by a virulent attack of ophthalmia. That disease was notoriously prevalent in the lowlands of Pamphylia through which he had been travelling, and if so contracted, would produce the symptoms described. The pathetic appeal to Galatian sympathy on the score of imperfect sight in vi. 11 confirms this view. If his sight had been impaired by an illness to which they had themselves ministered with tender solicitude, they would be quick to feel for his privation.—**τὸ πρότερον.** Lightfoot contends with justice that this phrase cannot on account of the prefixed article refer to an indefinite period in time past. The author clearly had in his mind two distinct periods, an earlier and a later, during the earlier of which he states that his preaching had been occasioned by illness. Lightfoot suggests that he referred perhaps to the two visits which he had paid to the Galatian Churches: and the suggestion is reasonable if his theory be accepted of sites in Northern Galatia, for no details are known of either visit. But it is quite incompatible with the history of his ministry in Southern Galatia recorded in Acts xiii., xiv. That lasted over two winters at the very least, comprised two visits at considerable intervals to each of

ὑμῖν τὸ πρότερον, 14. καὶ τὸν πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν[1] ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου οὐκ ἐξουθενήσατε οὐδὲ ἐξεπτύσατε, ἀλλ' ὡς ἄγγελον Θεοῦ ἐδέξασθέ με, ὡς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν. 15. ποῦ[2] οὖν ὁ μακαρισμὸς ὑμῶν; μαρτυρῶ γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι, εἰ δυνατόν, τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν ἐξορύξαντες ἐδώκατέ[3] μοι. 16. ὥστε ἐχθρὸς ὑμῶν γέγονα ἀληθεύων ὑμῖν, 17. Ζηλοῦσιν ὑμᾶς οὐ καλῶς, ἀλλὰ ἐκκλεῖσαι ὑμᾶς θέλουσιν, ἵνα αὐτοὺς ζηλοῦτε.

[1] υμων ℵABD[1]FG 17, etc.; μου τον D[3]EKLP.
[2] που ℵABCFGP 5, etc.; τις DEKL.
[3] εδωκατε ℵABCD[1] 17, 47; αν εδωκατε ℵ[c]D[3]EKLP.

the Churches, and displayed throughout as resolute an initiative, as determined energy, as vigorous activity, as can be found in the whole course of his apostolic career. That ministry gave certainly no sign of illness, but the contrary. We have seen, however, that it was preceded by a prolonged illness, during which he was probably confined to his sick chamber and could only minister to those who visited him there. His first ministry in Galatia passed in short through two distinct stages, first the private ministrations of a sick man, and then a public career of unexampled vigour and success. The last verse placed the readers on the division line between the two, for it reminded them of the memorable petition addressed to him and Barnabas at the close of his first public address in the synagogue of the Pisidian Antioch. It is, therefore, of the preceding period that he writes here, "You know that it was owing to illness that I had preached to you *up to that time* (**τὸ πρότερον**)". It is needless to dwell on the complete harmony of this interpretation with the context.

Ver. 14. **τὸν πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν.** The best MSS. all read **ὑμῶν**, not **μου** or **μου τον.** The accusative **τὸν πειρασμόν** is not governed by **ἐξουθενήσατε** or **ἐξεπτύσατε**, whose real object is the **με** which follows **ἐδέξασθε**: it is really a pendent accusative in apposition to the sentence: *As for the temptation to you in my flesh* (*i.e.*, the temptation to reject me with contempt and disgust on account of my diseased state), *you did not. . . .*

Ver. 15. **ποῦ οὖν . . .** The MSS. are decisive in favour of **ποῦ**, which makes excellent sense. "You congratulated yourselves," it is urged, "on my coming among you, you welcomed me as an angel, as Christ Himself: what has become of that feeling now? where is your satisfaction at your lot?"—**ἐδώκατε.** Some MSS. insert **αν** before this verb: the addition would be necessary in Attic Greek to express the conditional force of the clause, but is not needed in Helenistic Greek—**τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν.** The full force of **ὑμῶν** may be given in English by the rendering *your own eyes:* for it lays stress on the contrast between their eyes and those of Paul. The addition is significant, and strongly confirms the view that his eyes were the organ specially affected by his malady.

Ver. 16. **ὥστε** is often used in the sense of *therefore* to introduce an imperative or an affirmative conclusion in the Epistles of Paul, but not an interrogation. I can see no reason here for making the clause interrogative: the rendering *I am therefore become an enemy to you* is quite in harmony with the context, which assumes the existence of some actual estrangement. This estrangement is attributed to plain speaking which had given offence to the disciples. As he had seen no trace of coldness at the time of his recent visit, he must be referring to some language which he had used on that occasion. Circumstances forced him to take up strong ground at that time on the subject of circumcision and to denounce the opposition and intrigues which he had encountered from the Pharisaic party.

Vv. 17, 18. The substantive **ζῆλος** (probably derived from **ζέειν**, *burn*) denotes some kind of passionate desire. Whether it was of good or evil tendency depended on the nature of its object and the spirit in which it was pursued: for the same term was used to designate zeal for God or for some noble object, personal passion, or an exclusive spirit of selfish jealousy. The verb **ζηλοῦν** partakes of the same neutral quality. Its figurative meaning is here borrowed from the efforts of a lover to win favour. The Pharisaic party *affected* (*i.e.*, courted) the Galatians in a selfish spirit, being minded to shut them out of their rightful inheritance in

18. καλὸν δὲ τὸ ζηλοῦσθαι ἐν καλῷ πάντοτε, καὶ μὴ μόνον ἐν τῷ παρεῖναί με πρὸς ὑμᾶς, 19. τεκνία[1] μου, οὓς πάλιν ὠδίνω, μεχρις οὗ μορφωθῇ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν· 20. ἤθελον δὲ παρεῖναι πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἄρτι, καὶ ἀλλάξαι τὴν φωνήν μου, ὅτι ἀποροῦμαι ἐν ὑμῖν.

21. Λέγετέ μοι, οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον θέλοντες εἶναι, τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε;

[1] τεκνια ℵcACD³EKLP; τεκνα ℵBD¹FG.

Christ, that they might reduce them to dependence on their own Law. Paul also courted them, not for his own glory, but that he might join them to Christ, and he was glad that they should be courted at all times, even by others in his absence, if it was done in a right spirit. *They affect you* (he writes, *i.e.*, court you) *not honourably, but are minded to shut you out that you may affect them. But it is good for you to be affected at all times and not only when I am present with you.*—**ζηλοῦτε.** As there are no other instances of **ἵνα** being followed by an indicative present in Pauline language, it is probable that this and **φυσιοῦσθε** in 1 Cor. iv. 6 are really forms of the subjunctive, though **ζηλῶτε** is the contracted form in general use.

Ver. 19. **τεκνία μου.** This is an accusative in apposition to **ὑμᾶς,** not a vocative introducing a fresh appeal. It is clear from the addition of the connecting particle **δέ** after **ἤθελον** that that word begins a new sentence. **τεκνία** is usually a term of maternal endearment; and though addressed by John in his first Epistle to his children in Christ, is not used elsewhere by Paul, who prefers to address them as children (**τέκνα**), rather than as babes. But in this passage he is adopting the figure of a child-bearing mother; he is in travail for the spiritual birth of Christ within them (as he says), and straining all his powers to renew once more the spiritual life which had died in them until he could succeed in shaping their inner man afresh into the image of Christ.

Ver. 20. **ἤθελον.** This imperfect expresses a modified wish, qualified by implied conditions, like **ηὐχόμην** in Rom. ix. 3 and **ἐβουλόμην** in Acts xxv. 22. He would fain be with them now (**ἄρτι**) instead of waiting for some future opportunity, were it not that he was unavoidably detained by other claims.—**ἀλλάξαι.** This is interpreted by some as a threat of increased severity, by others as a craving for the use of gentler words; but neither interpretation agrees with the regular Greek usage of the word. The natural meaning of the Greek expression is to exchange the voice for some other means of persuasion, in this case for the pen, and this sense is clearly indicated by the context. Paul longs to come and speak to them instead of writing, and is confident of his power to clear away doubts and errors by personal intercourse. —**ἀποροῦμαι.** This middle voice denotes the inward distress of a mind tossed to and fro by conflicting doubts and fears.

Vv. 21-30. PATRIARCHAL HISTORY IS EMPLOYED TO ILLUSTRATE THE PERSECUTION OF CHRISTIANS, WHO ARE THE PROMISED SEED OF ABRAHAM, BY JEWS WHO ARE HIS SEED AFTER THE FLESH. HAGAR AND HER SON, SARAH AND HER SON, FURNISH PROPHETIC TYPES OF THE MUTUAL RELATIONS BETWEEN THE TWO. AS HIS ELDER SON, THE SLAVE-BORN ISHMAEL, WAS CAST OUT FOR MOCKING THE FREEBORN CHILD, SO THE OLDER ISRAEL UNDER BONDAGE TO THE LAW WILL BRING ON THEMSELVES THE DOOM OF NATIONAL REJECTION BY PERSECUTING THE TRUE ISRAEL OF GOD WHOM CHRIST HATH ENDOWED WITH THE FREEDOM OF THE SPIRIT.—The force of this illustration depends on the distinction drawn in iii. 16-22 between the seed of promise and the seed of Abraham after the flesh. The argument of Rom. ix. 6 . . . is likewise based on the successive exclusion of the latter from inheritance of the blessing. John the Baptist and Jesus Himself expressly warned the Jews not to rely on their claim to be sons of Abraham.

Isaac the child of promise, only son of a free mother after years of barrenness, and heir to an indisputable birthright, aptly prefigured the Church of Christ, born in the fulness of time, made free by the gift of the Spirit, and established for ever in the house of their heavenly Father by an eternal covenant of adoption. Ishmael again, who had for some years filled the position of a son without the birthright which could entitle him to inherit the blessing, but was eventually driven out for his mockery of the promised child, supplied an exact prototype of

22. Γέγραπται γὰρ, ὅτι Ἀβραὰμ δύο υἱοὺς ἔσχεν, ἕνα ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης, καὶ ἕνα ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας· ἀλλ᾽ ὁ μὲν ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης κατὰ σάρκα γεγέννηται, 23. ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας δι᾽ ἐπαγγελίας.[1] 24. ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα· αὗται γάρ εἰσιν δύο[2] διαθῆκαι· μία μὲν ἀπὸ ὄρους Σινᾶ, εἰς δουλείαν γεννῶσα, ἥτις ἐστὶν Ἄγαρ 25. (τὸ γὰρ[3] Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ), συστοιχεῖ δὲ τῇ

[1] δι᾽ επαγγελιας ℵAC 17, 73; δια της επ. BDEFGKLP.
δυο (without αι) ℵcABCDEFGKLP.
[3] το γαρ ℵCFG; το δε 17; το Αγαρ B; το δε Αγαρ ADE; το γαρ Αγαρ KLP.

Israel after the flesh, long recognised as the people of God, but bound under the Law, and eventually destined to be shut out from the household of God for their guilt in persecuting Christ and His Church. —**τ. νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε.** This is a remonstrance addressed to men who are bent on upholding the authority of the Law, but are indifferent to the lessons which it teaches. **ἀκούειν** has this force of *listening*, not only when used absolutely, but when coupled as it is here with an accusative (*cf.* Luke x. 39, Eph. i. 13).

Ver. 22. **γέγραπται ὅτι.** The statement which follows is not a quotation, but a summary of recorded facts.

Hagar and Sarah are entitled *the* handmaid and *the* freewoman because they are accepted types of each class in Scripture. In the LXX **παιδίσκη** denotes *any* young woman (*e.g.*, Ruth) as it does in Attic Greek, but in the N.T. **παιδίσκη**, a *handmaid*, corresponds to **παῖς**, a male servant.

Ver. 23. The two who were coupled together in the last verse as sons of one father are here contrasted in respect of their different mothers. — **γεγέννηται.** The perfect is used in order to present the birth as a Scripture record now in existence (*cf.* Heb. xi. 17, 28 . . .): otherwise the aorist **ἐγεννήθη** would have been appropriate. — **δι᾽ ἐπαγγελίας.** There is an alternative reading **διὰ τῆς ἐπ.** supported by equal MS. authority: but it is difficult to attach any meaning to the article, whereas **δι᾽ ἐπαγγ.** forms an appropriate antithesis to **κατὰ σάρκα.** Like **διὰ νόμου** in ii. 19, 21 it describes the attendant circumstances under which the birth took place, **διά** not having an instrumental force.

Ver. 24. **ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα.** No doubt is thrown on the historical truth of the patriarchal history by classing the story of Ishmael with allegories: though an additional value is thereby claimed for it as embodying spiritual truth, and typifying the permanent relation between the two seeds.—**αὗται γάρ εἰσιν.** The two women are identified with the two covenants, the Sinaitic and the Christian, which they typify: and the characteristic features of the two are declared to be slavery and freedom.—**γεννῶσα.** This term is applied to the conception of the mother in Luke i. 13, 57 also, though more often applied to the father.

Ver. 25. **τὸ γὰρ.** The variety of readings in the MSS., **το Αγαρ, το γαρ Αγαρ, το δε Αγαρ, το γαρ,** indicates some primitive error of transcription. It is hardly possible to extract any reasonable sense from the three first: for **τὸ Ἄγαρ** cannot mean Hagar herself: it denotes the name Hagar, and Stanley's attempt to connect this name with Sinai proved futile. How then can the statement be understood that the name Hagar is Sinai, or that it answers to Jerusalem? How again can the superfluous description of Sinai as a mountain in Arabia be explained? Moreover, the reading **τὸ Ἄγαρ** without any connecting particle is intolerable in Greek language, and **δέ** or **γάρ** was probably added to correct the solecism. Hence I conclude that **Ἄγαρ** was probably an error in transcription for the original **γάρ,** suggested by its occurrence immediately before.

The statement in the text on the contrary, *For Sinai is a mountain in Arabia*, is full of meaning when it is remembered that Hagar had no connection with Sinai itself, but that she found a home for herself and her children in Arabia.—**συστοιχεῖ.** The previous clause **τὸ γὰρ . . . Ἀραβίᾳ** is a parenthesis, **ἥτις** is therefore the subject of **συστοιχεῖ.** The Apostle finds in the actual state of Jerusalem and her children the same characteristic feature of slavery as in the covenant of Sinai.

Ver. 26. **ἡ ἄνω Ἱερ.** The Psalms and

νῦν Ἰερουσαλὴμ, δουλεύει γὰρ[1] μετὰ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς. 26. ἡ δὲ ἄνω Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν, ἥτις ἐστὶ μήτηρ ἡμῶν. 27. γέγραπται γὰρ, Εὐφράνθητι, στεῖρα ἡ οὐ τίκτουσα· ῥῆξον καὶ βόησον, ἡ οὐκ ὠδίνουσα· ὅτι πολλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐρήμου μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς ἐχούσης τὸν ἄνδρα. 28. ἡμεῖς δὲ, ἀδελφοὶ, κατὰ Ἰσαὰκ ἐπαγγελίας τέκνα ἐσμέν. 29. Ἀλλ' ὥσπερ τότε ὁ κατὰ

[1] δουλευει γαρ ℵABCDFGP; δ. δε D^3EKL.

Prophets attest the enthusiastic devotion of Israelites to the city of Jerusalem. Since the temple of God and the palace of the house of David were within its walls, it was at once the holy city round which clustered the religious feelings of Israel, and the city of the great king, of whom the royal house of David were representatives (*cf.* Ps. xlviii.). The events of the captivity and restoration associated it still more intimately with the national fortunes and aspirations of Israel. Hence both Isaiah and Ezekiel invested it with ideal glory in their prophetic anticipations of the Messianic kingdom. Their visions of its future destiny looked forward to its becoming the centre of a world-wide worship: there the great King of all the earth would manifest His presence, and thither would flow all nations, offering their homage and bearing due tribute of gifts and sacrifices. But the Hebrew ideal scarcely rose above imaginations of an earthly city and a temple on the mountains of Israel. It was the function of Christian inspiration to spiritualise this conception, to eliminate its local association with the typical temple on earth, and to substitute a heavenly for an earthly city. The Apocalypse bears witness to the process of transition. Though it adheres closely to the vision of Ezekiel, and continues to employ material imagery for expressing the dazzling brightness and intense purity of the temple-city, yet the New Jerusalem is now seen coming down from heaven to a new earth; in place of earthly light it is illuminated by the light which emanates from the throne of God and of the Lamb; and material images are interpreted as symbols of moral beauty and spiritual holiness. The Epistle to the Hebrews views the heavenly Jerusalem from another side. Whereas the Apocalypse depicts its buildings, streets and rivers, the Epistle describes the throng of angels, the assembly of the first-born, the spirits of departed saints that are gathered there round the throne of God, and contrasts the awful majesty of the living God with the material terrors of Sinai. This Epistle presents the contrast between the earthly and the heavenly Jerusalem, and between the covenants of Sinai and of Christ in a different aspect. For the Apostle embodies in his conception a purely Greek ideal of a city, the mother and home of freemen. A self-governed body of free citizens, subject to no foreign control, but maintaining justice and order in perfect peace by their own sovereign will, furnishes him with an appropriate type of the heavenly commonwealth, whereof Christians are even now citizens, dwelling in peace together in the unity of Christian brotherhood, and independent of all restraints of law because they themselves do the will of God from the heart.

The Hebrew form **Ἰερουσαλήμ** is naturally preferred to the Greek in all these passages, because Jerusalem is personified as an ideal city. The stress here laid on the freedom of Christ's disciples recalls the conversation of Christ with the Jews in John viii. 32 . . . but the bondage is there more distinctly associated with actual sin.

Ver. 27. The prophecy of Isaiah liv. 1, here quoted from the LXX, describes the restoration of Zion, the enlargement of her borders and increase of her people, under the figure of a wife long neglected and barren, but now restored to the favour of her husband and fruitful in children. This picture was perhaps suggested to the prophet by the history of Sarah's prolonged barrenness before she became the fruitful mother of Israel, and is peculiarly appropriate for describing the long delayed but fertile growth of the Christian Church, of which she was the typical mother.

Ver. 29. **ἐδίωκεν.** This imperfect denotes a tendency and disposition rather than actual persecution on the part of Ishmael. The nearest approach to it recorded is in fact his mockery of Isaac on the occasion of his weaning (Gen. xxi. 9). The LXX gives a different version of his conduct on that occasion,

σάρκα γεννηθεὶς ἐδίωκε τὸν κατὰ πνεῦμα, οὕτω καὶ νῦν· 30. ἀλλὰ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή; Ἔκβαλε τὴν παιδίσκην καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς· οὐ γὰρ μὴ κληρονομήσῃ ὁ υἱὸς τῆς παιδίσκης μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἐλευθέρας.

31. Διό, ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἐσμὲν παιδίσκης τέκνα, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐλευθέρας V. 1. τῇ[1] ἐλευθερίᾳ ἡμᾶς[2] Χριστὸς ἠλευθέρωσε· στήκετε[3] οὖν καὶ

[1] τη ελευθεριᾳ ℵABCDP; τη ελ. ουν C³KL; τη ελ. η D³EKL; η ελ. FG.
[2] ημας Χρ. ℵABDEFGP 17, etc.; Χρ. ημας ℵᶜCKL.
[3] στηκετε ουν ℵABCFGP 17, etc.; om. ουν DEKL.

which is accepted in the margin of the Revised Version, and seems more in harmony with the circumstances, *viz.*, that he was playing with the child, bearing himself in short as an elder brother in the family, and that the jealousy of Sarah was aroused lest he should claim an elder brother's share of the inheritance. But the Apostle adopts the traditional view of his conduct which was accepted by the Jews, in consequence perhaps of the subsequent feud between the two races; and discovers in Ishmael the same jealous temper that was exhibited by Jewish persecutors towards the infant Church.

Ver. 30. Again, the expulsion of Ishmael gives warning that those who observe the letter of the Law only, and lack the true spirit of sonship, though they render formal obedience to the will of the Father, have no abiding inheritance in His house.

CHAPTERS IV. 31—V. 12. FREEDOM IS OUR BIRTHRIGHT IN CHRIST AND AN ESSENTIAL CONDITION OF OUR CALL. ACCORDINGLY THE APOSTLE PROTESTS AGAINST THE CLAIM THAT ALL CHRISTIANS SHOULD BE CIRCUMCISED, AS A DEPARTURE FROM THE SPIRIT OF CHRIST, A DANGEROUS INNOVATION WHICH THE CHURCHES WILL CERTAINLY CONDEMN, AND A SUPERSTITION OF THE FLESH ON A PAR WITH THE GROSSEST HEATHEN SUPERSTITIONS.—Ver. 31. The preceding allegory has illustrated the essential difference between the heritage of Jews and Christians. Whereas Jews inherit bondage to Law, freedom is the Christian birthright, derived from their heavenly mother. The Apostle now proceeds to enforce the truth that Christ bestowed this freedom upon us, and that it is an essential principle of our call.

CHAPTER V.—Ver. 1. In the original text, which I have adopted in accordance with the best MS. authority, the first clause of this verse is clearly detached from the second **στήκετε οὖν**, and attached to the preceding **ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐλευθέρας** without any connecting particle. But this primary connection with the preceding verse was apparently obscured at an early period of Church history, owing probably to the frequent use of the important section v. 1 ff. as a Church lesson by itself apart from the preceding allegory. It is difficult otherwise to account for the great variety of connecting particles employed in MS. versions and quotations to transform the fragment **τῇ ἐλευθ. ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς ἠλευθ.** into a complete sentence, *e.g.*, the addition of **ᾗ, οὖν,** or **γάρ,** and the omission of **οὖν** after **στήκετε,** all evidently corrections made with one object. The division of chapters has unfortunately perpetuated this error. But the removal of the full stop after **ἐλευθέρας** at once restores the full force of the original passage: *Wherefore, brethren, we are not children of a handmaid, but Christ set us free with the freedom of the freewoman.* The threefold iteration, *free, freedom, freewoman*, marks with expressive emphasis the importance of this Christian birthright.—**ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς.** The best MSS. place the object **ἡμᾶς** before the subject **Χριστός,** inverting the usual order of words. This inversion throws an emphasis on **ἡμᾶς,** as the previous context demands; for the whole passage forcibly contrasts the freedom granted to us Christians with the bondage which the Jews inherit.—**μὴ πάλιν . . .** Converts had all alike, whether Jews or Greeks, been under bondage to some law, human or divine: all had been set free by Christ, but might now, by the voluntary adoption of circumcision, forfeit this freedom and rivet the yoke of Law about their own necks.

Ver. 2. **ἐγὼ.** The Apostle finds it necessary to express pointedly his own personal judgment on the effect of circumcision in consequence of false reports which had been circulated that he had

μὴ πάλιν ζυγῷ δουλείας ἐνέχεσθε. 2. ἴδε ἐγὼ Παῦλος λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἐὰν περιτέμνησθε, Χριστὸς ὑμᾶς οὐδὲν ὠφελήσει· 3. μαρτύρομαι δὲ πάλιν παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ περιτεμνομένῳ, ὅτι ὀφειλέτης ἐστὶν ὅλον τὸν νόμον ποιῆσαι. 4. κατηργήθητε ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, οἵτινες ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοῦσθε, τῆς χάριτος ἐξεπέσατε· 5. ἡμεῖς γὰρ πνεύματι ἐκ πίστεως ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης ἀπεκδεχόμεθα. 6. ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ οὔτε περιτομή τι ἰσχύει, οὔτε ἀκροβυστία, ἀλλὰ πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη. 7. Ἐτρέχετε καλῶς· τίς ὑμᾶς ἐνέκοψεν[1]

[1] ενεκοψεν ℵABCDEFGKLP; ανεκοψεν rec.

given some sanction to the new doctrine. (See ver. 11.)

Ver. 3. **μαρτύρομαι.** This verb, which in Attic Greek denotes the calling of witnesses, is applied in Pauline language to the Apostle's own testimony.—**περιτέμνησθε, περιτεμνομένῳ.** The use of the present tense intimates that the warning is not aimed at isolated acts, but at the introduction of a systematic practice involving a virtual transfer of allegiance from Christ to the Law.

Ver. 4. **κατηργήθητε.** This verb is applied with comprehensive force to any destruction of growth and life, physical or spiritual, beneficial or deleterious. Joined with **ἀπό** it denotes the loss of some essential element of life by the severance of previous intimate relations, *e.g.*, annulment by death of a wife's obligations to her husband (Rom. vii. 2), and emancipation from the control of the Law by spiritual death (Rom. vii. 6). Here, in like manner, it denotes the paralysis of spiritual life by severance of union with Christ. This paralysis produces a deadening effect on the whole spiritual nature, and results in the continuous craving for legal justification which is expressed by **δικαιοῦσθε.** — **ἐξεπέσατε.** As the quasi-passive verb **ἐκπίπτειν** corresponds to the active verb **ἐκβάλλειν,** this aorist corresponds to **ἔκβαλε** in iv. 30; so that the combination of **κατηργήθητε** with **ἐξεπέσατε** contains a special allusion to the doom of Ishmael, who suffered the loss of his inheritance at the same time that he was cast out from his father's house. Disloyal children of God, who prefer bondage to filial freedom, have by their own act forfeited the birthright of sons, and been cast out from His favour and blessing.

Ver. 5. **πνεύματι.** In the absence of an article this dative must have an adverbial force, and should be rendered *in spirit*. The Holy Spirit is uniformly designated **τὸ Πνεῦμα.** — **ἀπεκδεχόμεθα.** This verb expresses eager expectation rather than the attitude of patient waiting attributed to it in our versions. True faith in Christ inspires a confident hope of acceptance (**δικαιοσύνης**) before God.

Ver. 6. Circumcision conveyed no spiritual blessing in return for its binding pledge of obedience to the Law. In 1 Cor. vii. 17-22 it is placed in the same category as marriage and slavery, outward conditions of life which are neither good nor evil in themselves, but are the appointed portion of some, who should therefore loyally accept the burden or the blessing. Paul not only paid due respect to the Law himself, but even circumcised Timothy, when he desired to take him with him as his minister in Christ amidst Jews, that he might avoid needless offence. But he warned his disciples at the same time that in resorting to it for salvation they were really denying the faith, and forfeiting their birthright of Christian freedom.—**δι' ἀγάπης.** The rendering of our versions *by* or *through love* confuses faith with love, as though faith was the result of love or worked through its instrumentality. But the clause really describes a combination of two distinct graces: there may be intense faith without love (*cf.* 1 Cor. xiii. 2); but faith ought to work *in love*, *i.e.*, in a spirit of love. Love is the atmosphere amid which faith should put forth its energy. This force of **διά** has been already noted in the case of **διὰ νόμου** (ii. 19).—**ἐνεργουμένη.** The middle voice is here employed to describe the inner working of the spirit of man, the active is used for recording God's work for man in ii. 8.

Ver. 7. **ἐνέκοψεν.** The figure of a race, introduced by **ἐτρέχετε,** is here carried on. Hitherto they had run a smooth course of obedience to truth; who had thrown obstacles in their way?

Ver. 8. It was God who called Abraham, Moses, Samuel and the prophets of

ἀληθείᾳ[1] μὴ πείθεσθαι; 8. ἡ πεισμονὴ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος ὑμᾶς. 9. Μικρὰ ζύμη ὅλον τὸ φύραμα ζυμοῖ. 10. ἐγὼ πέποιθα εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐν Κυρίῳ, ὅτι οὐδὲν ἄλλο φρονήσετε· ὁ δὲ ταράσσων ὑμᾶς βαστάσει τὸ κρῖμα, ὅστις ἂν ᾖ. 11. ἐγὼ δέ, ἀδελφοί, εἰ περιτομὴν ἔτι κηρύσσω, τί ἔτι διώκομαι; ἄρα κατήργηται τὸ σκάνδαλον τοῦ σταυροῦ; 12. ὄφελον καὶ ἀποκόψονται οἱ ἀναστατοῦντες ὑμᾶς.

13. Ὑμεῖς γὰρ ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ ἐκλήθητε, ἀδελφοί· μόνον μὴ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῇ σαρκὶ, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης δουλεύετε

[1] αληθειᾳ ℵAB; τῃ αλ. CDEFGKL.

old and was now calling the Galatians through the Gospel of which Paul was minister, but this new persuasion was no true gospel, and did not come forth from Him.

Ver. 9. Leaven became a type of moral and spiritual corruption in virtue of the fermentation it engenders. A very small lump might readily form a centre of widespread corruption; so stringent precautions were adopted in Jewish households for the removal of every particle before the days of unleavened bread. Hence the origin of the proverb quoted here and in 1 Cor. v. 6. It is clear that the taint of heresy had not yet spread widely through the Galatian Churches: it was more its insidious nature than its actual extent that alarmed the Apostle.

Ver. 10. The emphatic **ἐγώ** with which this verse opens reminds the converts of the Apostle's personal claims in the Lord on their allegiance. He reckons with confidence on their support in pronouncing the judgment of their church on any who may disregard this warning. Every offender shall bear his own responsibility, whoever he may be.

Ver. 11. It seems strange in view of Paul's later career that he should have needed to repudiate, however briefly and scornfully, the charge of still preaching circumcision as he had before his conversion. After his open breach with the synagogue, indeed, at Corinth and at Ephesus it would have been hardly possible to advance such a plea. But he had recently, before writing this Epistle, taken two steps open to this misconstruction on which agitators could fasten. He had deposited with the Galatians for their guidance the resolution adopted by the Church at Jerusalem which recommended scrupulous regard for the Law in certain matters, and he had himself circumcised a Galatian convert whose father had been a Greek. Paul contents himself with pointing for answer to the persecutions which he was still enduring at the hands of Jews, probably those which befel him in Macedonia.—**ἄρα.** The interrogative **ἄρα** is far more appropriate to the context than the inferential **ἄρα.** The Apostle, being accused of currying favour with the Jews, points indignantly to the persecutions he was suffering from them and exclaims, "Hath the stumbling-block of the Cross been done away?"

Ver. 12. **ὄφελον.** This adverb occurs also in 1 Cor. iv. 8, 2 Cor. xi. 1, Rev. iii. 15. In all three places it expresses dissatisfaction with the actual position, "Would that it were otherwise". But it acquires this force from its combination with past tenses, like the aorist **ὤφελον** in Attic Greek. When coupled however with a future as it is here, it does not express a wish, but like the future of **ὀφείλειν** declares what ought to be the logical outcome of the present. The clause predicts in bitter irony to what final consummation this superstitious worship of circumcision must lead. Men who exalt an ordinance of the flesh above the spirit of Christ will be bound in the end to proceed to mutilation of the flesh like heathen votaries. — **ἀποκόψονται.** This word was habitually used to describe the practice of mutilation which was so prevalent in the Phrygian worship of Cybele. The Galatians were necessarily familiar with it, and it can hardly bear any other sense.—**ἀναστατοῦντες.** This word forcibly expresses the revolutionary character of the agitation which was upsetting the peace and order of the Galatian Churches. It is used in Acts xvii. 6, xxi. 38 to denounce seditious and riotous conduct.

Vv. 13-15. FREEDOM IS AN ESSENTIAL ELEMENT OF CHRISTIAN LIFE, TO BE USED NOT FOR SELF-INDULGENCE, BUT FOR WILLING SERVICE TO THE LAW OF

ἀλλήλοις. 14. Ὁ γὰρ πᾶς νόμος ἐν ἑνὶ λόγῳ πεπλήρωται,[1] ἐν τῷ, Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.[2] 15. εἰ δὲ ἀλλήλους δάκνετε καὶ κατεσθίετε, βλέπετε μὴ ὑπὸ ἀλλήλων ἀναλωθῆτε.

16. Λέγω δὲ, Πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε, καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς οὐ μὴ τελέσητε. 17. ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα κατὰ τῆς σαρκός· ταῦτα γὰρ[3] ἀλλήλοις ἀντίκειται,[4] ἵνα μὴ

[1] πεπληρωται ℵABC 17, etc.; πληρουται DEFGKLP.
[2] σεαυτον ℵABCDEK 17; εαυτον FGLP.
[3] ταυτα γαρ ℵBD¹EFG 17; ταυτα δε ℵᶜACD³KLP.
[4] αλλ. αντικ. ABCDEFG; αντικ. αλλ. ℵKLP.

LOVE.—Ver. 13. **ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ.** Our versions render this *unto* (*for* R.V.) *freedom*, as though it were the design of the Gospel to lead to freedom. But the Greek text affirms rather that God's call was based upon freedom, and so makes it an essential element in spiritual life and the inalienable right of every true Christian.—**μόνον μὴ.** A warning is added that freedom, essential as it is to spiritual life, is open to abuse by carnal men, and that it is subject to the demands of the higher Law of mutual love. "Only do not treat it as an opening for carnal self-indulgence, but for loving service to each other." **μόνον** is used in the same elliptical way in ii. 10 and 2 Thess. ii. 7; and the ellipsis of the verb after **μή** is common in rhetorical passages.—**ἀφορμήν.** This term was applied in military language to a base of operations, and generally to any starting-point for action. In Rom. vii. 8, 11, 2 Cor. xi. 12 it denotes an opening for sin, as it does here.—**δουλεύετε.** This injunction contains an instructive paradox. Christians are freed from the trammels of outward Law, not that they may please themselves, but that they may become slaves to the Law of mutual love. The true ideal of the Christian is not freedom, but unfettered service to the love of God and man, which annihilates self, and subordinates all selfish desires to perfect love. A similar paradox is found in 1 Cor. vii. 22, *he that was called, being free, is the bondservant of Christ.*

Ver. 14. **πεπλήρωται.** MS. authority is decisive in favour of this perfect against the present **πληροῦται.** The perfect is likewise adopted in the parallel passage Rom. xiii. 8, **ὁ ἀγαπῶν νόμον πεπλήρωκεν.** For the very existence of love in the heart attests the completion of a previous inward act of the will.—**ἐν ἑνὶ λόγῳ.** The single precept which follows embodies in itself the whole duty to man. —**τὸν πλησίον.** The language of Lev. xix. 18 is here invested with the comprehensive force which Christ attached to the word *neighbour* by his teaching.

Ver. 15. If the spirit of mutual love does not prevent Christian brethren from preying on one another, they are in danger of utter destruction.

Vv. 16-24. MEN WHO REGULATE THEIR LIVES BY THE SPIRIT WILL NOT CARRY OUT DESIRES OF THE FLESH. FOR GOD HAS SET THESE TWO FORCES IN MUTUAL ANTAGONISM WITHIN OUR HEARTS FOR THE EXPRESS PURPOSE OF KEEPING DUE CHECK UPON THE WILL. SO IF YE BE GUIDED BY THE SPIRIT, YE ARE NOT SUBJECT TO LAW: FOR THE SPIRIT MASTERS UNLAWFUL LUSTS BEFORE THEY ISSUE IN ACTION: AND ITS FRUITS ARE SUCH AS NO LAW CAN CONDEMN.—Ver. 16. **Πνεύματι περιπ.**: *Walk by the spirit, i.e.*, Regulate your lives by the rule of the spirit. You will not then fulfil the desire of the flesh.

Ver. 17. **σὰρξ . . . πνεῦμα.** All the various motives which operate on the mind and will to prompt intention and action are comprehended under one of the two categories, spirit and flesh. The line of division between them corresponds to that drawn in 1 Cor. ii. 14 between the natural man (**ψυχικός**) and the spiritual. The spirit of man owes its original existence to the quickening inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and depends for its continued life on the constant supply of his life-giving power: its impulses are therefore purely spiritual. In the term flesh are included all other desires of the natural man, not only the appetites and passions which he inherits in common with the animal creation, but all the desires that he conceives for the satisfaction of heart or mind. — **ἐπιθυμεῖ.** This is a neutral term equally applicable to the good desires of the spirit and the evil lusts of the flesh. **ἀντίκειται ἀλλ.**

ἃ ἂν θέλητε, ταῦτα ποιῆτε. 18. εἰ δὲ πνεύματι ἄγεσθε, οὐκ ἐστὲ ὑπὸ νόμον. 19. φανερὰ δέ ἐστι τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκὸς,[1] ἅτινά ἐστι πορνεία, ἀκαθαρσία, ἀσέλγεια, 20. εἰδωλολατρεία, φαρμακεία, ἔχθραι, ἔρις,[1] ζῆλος,[2] θυμοὶ, ἐριθεῖαι, διχοστασίαι, αἱρέσεις, 21. φθόνοι,[3] φόνοι, μέθαι, κῶμοι, καὶ τὰ ὅμοια τούτοις· ἃ προλέγω ὑμῖν, καθὼς προεῖπον, ὅτι οἱ τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες βασιλείαν Θεοῦ οὐ

[1] ερις ℵABD[1]; ερεις CD[3]EFGKLP.
[2] ζηλος BDEFGP 17; ζηλοι ℵCD[3]KL.
[3] Insert φονοι ACDEFGKLP after φθονοι; om. ℵB 17, etc.

ἴνα. After the coexistence of two conflicting forces, spirit and flesh, in the heart of man has been definitely affirmed, it is here added that these are set (*sc.* by divine appointment) in mutual antagonism to each other for the express purpose of due control over the human will. Both alike derive their being from the same Creator, though one belongs to the natural, the other to the spiritual, creation: both alike continue by His will to fulfil their several parts in the scheme of Christian life. It is beside the purpose of the Epistle to analyse the functions of the flesh in the economy of nature, or to affirm the absolute dependence of the human will on the spontaneous action of its desires for vital force and energy: enough that by the will of God they too form an essential element in Christian life: the Epistle deals not with their beneficial action, but with their liability to perversion. For their indiscriminate craving for indulgence renders them constantly liable to become ministers of sin. The mind of the flesh, if left without a check, issues in enmity to God and death (*cf.* Rom. viii. 6, 7). Wholesome restraint is therefore a condition essential to their healthy action. In every community this is to a certain extent provided by the discipline of education, by social order and law. But in true Christians a far more effective control is maintained by the spirit, since it is capable of combating every wrong desire within the heart before it issues in sinful action, and so by constantly checking any wrong indulgence it gradually neutralises the power of selfish appetites, and establishes an habitual supremacy over the whole mind and will, until in the ideal Christian it brings them into perfect harmony with the mind of Christ.

Ver. 18. Law finds no just occasion against men who are led by the spirit, for they themselves check every wrong desire within them, and so fulfil the whole Law. The identity of Law with justice and right is, of course, assumed.

Ver. 19. Though this verse enumerates only evil works of the flesh, it is not thereby suggested that its action is wholly evil; for the flesh has been shown to have its appointed function from God, and to be essential to the human will. The opening ἅτινα puts the following catalogue of crimes and vices in its true light as samples, produced by way of specimen of the evil effects wrought by excessive indulgence of natural appetites without due control, and not an exhaustive list of the works of the flesh, as the rendering *which*, in our versions, rather suggests. The list begins and ends with sensual vices due to the lower animal nature; it couples *idolatry* with its habitual ally *sorcery:* in specifying the various quarrels between man and man it adds two διχοστασίαι and αἱρέσεις to the corresponding list in 2 Cor. xii. 20, perhaps owing to the prevalence of religious dissensions in the Galatian churches.—**ἀσέλγεια.** This term, which in classical Greek expresses insolent contempt for public opinion, denotes in the N.T. shameless outrages on public decency—a fit climax to fornication and uncleanness.

Ver. 20. **ζῆλος.** See note on iv. 17.—**ἐριθίαι.** The apparent derivation of this word from ἔριθος (*a hireling*) points to mercenary motives. The Apostle elsewhere associates it with jealousy, envy and vainglory, and contrasts it with sincerity, union and love. It denotes, probably, selfish intrigues.—**αἱρέσεις.** This term is used in the N.T. to designate any religious sect or party, *e.g.*, the Pharisees, Sadducees, Nazarenes (as the Jews designated Christians).

Ver. 21. **προεῖπον.** No particular admonition is here specified: warnings against these sins had, of course, formed the staple of many former discourses.

The Epistle has already claimed for

κληρονομήσουσιν. 22. ὁ δὲ καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματός ἐστιν ἀγάπη, χαρὰ, εἰρήνη, μακροθυμία, χρηστότης, ἀγαθωσύνη, πίστις, 23. πραΰτης, ἐγκράτεια· κατὰ τῶν τοιούτων οὐκ ἔστι νόμος. 24. οἱ δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ[1] τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσαν σὺν τοῖς παθήμασι καὶ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις. 25. Εἰ ζῶμεν πνεύματι, πνεύματι καὶ στοιχῶμεν. 26. μὴ γινώμεθα κενόδοξοι, ἀλλήλους προκαλούμενοι, ἀλλήλοις φθονοῦντες. VI. 1. Ἀδελφοὶ, ἐὰν καὶ προληφθῇ ἄνθρωπος ἔν τινι παραπτώματι, ὑμεῖς οἱ πνευματικοὶ καταρτίζετε τὸν τοιοῦτον ἐν πνεύματι

[1] Χρ. Ιησου ℵABCP 17, etc.; om. Ιησου DEFGKL.

Christians the inheritance of sons. That this inheritance included a kingdom needed no proof; for the conception of a Messianic kingdom ran through Hebrew prophecy and covered the whole range of Gospel teaching.

Ver. 22. Since the object of this verse is to exhibit the harmony between the fruit of the spirit and the restraints of law, those qualities only are specified which affect man's duty to his neighbour. *Love* with its unfailing attendants, inward *joy* and *peace*, supplies the motive power; *long-suffering* in the face of wrongs and ill-treatment, *kindness* in rendering service to others, and *goodness* in the free bestowal of bounty on those who need, cannot fail to gain goodwill; *good faith*, *meekness*, *self-control* enlist confidence and respect.—**πίστις.** It is clear from the subordinate place here assigned to **πίστις** that it does not here denote the cardinal grace of faith in God which is the very root of all religion, but rather good faith in dealings with men, and due regard to their just claims.

Ver. 23. **πραΰτης**: *Meekness* is the outcome of true humility, the bearing towards others which results from a lowly estimate of ourselves.—**ἐγκράτεια**: *Self-control* comprehends every form of temperance, and includes the mastery of all appetites, tempers and passions.

Ver. 24. **ἐσταύρωσαν.** The Apostle has already traced back his own spiritual life to the fellowship with the crucifixion of Christ, which he had undergone at his conversion (ii. 20). He assumes that his converts have likewise crucified the will of the flesh—not, however (as the previous context shows), that that will is already dead, but that the spirit has by one decisive victory asserted its complete supremacy in all true Christians, and so given an earnest of its entire triumph in the end.—**παθήμασιν.** This word departs here from its usual meaning, *sufferings*, and expresses inward emotions, as in Rom. vii. 5. Greek philosophers applied **πάθος** in like manner to denote active impulses of passion.

Chapter V. 25.—VI. 6. Rules of Conduct dictated by the spirit of Mutual Love.—Ver. 25. Here, as in ii. 20, the thought of crucifixion with Christ suggests that of the new life which is its sequel. *If*, then, *we live in spirit* (*i.e.*, if we have spiritual life), let us take the spirit for the rule to guide our conduct.

Ver. 26. The English version *provoking* introduces an idea of wanton provocation which does not belong to the Latin *provocantes*, nor to the Greek **προκαλούμενοι**, for this denotes challenges to combat, and so describes the spirit of defiance which animated rival parties amid the heated atmosphere of religious controversy. The verse denounces the vainglorious temper of party leaders which found vent in mutual defiance and ill-will.

Ver. 1. **Ἀδελφοὶ.** The last verse protested against unbrotherly tempers; this appeal presents, by way of contrast, the claims of brotherly love even in the case of real wrongdoing.—**καὶ προληφθῇ.** The English version *overtaken* suggests the idea of sudden temptation, and so tends to palliate the guilt of the offender, but the Greek denotes rather his surprise in the very act, and so lays stress on the reality of his guilt. The passage is urging the tender treatment of actual offenders, and the preceding **καί** enforces the claims even of guilty brethren on Christian charity: "Brethren, if a man be actually detected . . . deal tenderly with him in a spirit of meekness."—**καταρτίζετε.** This verb denotes sometimes the original framing of a mechanism (*e.g.*, of the human body and of the universe in Heb. x. 5, xi. 3), but more often its readjustment (*e.g.*, the setting of a broken limb, or the mending of nets in Matt. iv. 21). Here it indicates the correction of an offender with a view to

πραΰτητος, σκοπῶν σεαυτὸν μὴ καὶ σὺ πειρασθῇς· 2. ἀλλήλων τὰ βάρη βαστάζετε, καὶ οὕτως ἀναπληρώσατε τὸν νόμον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. 3. εἰ γὰρ δοκεῖ τις εἶναί τι μηδὲν ὢν, φρεναπατᾷ ἑαυτὸν[1]· 4. τὸ δὲ ἔργον ἑαυτοῦ δοκιμαζέτω ἕκαστος, καὶ τότε εἰς ἑαυτὸν μόνον τὸ καύχημα ἕξει, καὶ οὐκ εἰς τὸν ἕτερον· 5. ἕκαστος γὰρ τὸ ἴδιον φορτίον βαστάσει. 6. Κοινωνείτω δὲ ὁ κατηχούμενος τὸν λόγον τῷ κατηχοῦντι ἐν πᾶσιν ἀγαθοῖς. 7. μὴ πλανᾶσθε, Θεὸς οὐ μυκτηρί-

[1] φρεναπατᾳ ε. ℵABC 17, etc.; εαυτον φρ. DEFGKLP.

his restoration; and the need of meekness and forbearance for the due execution of this delicate task is enforced.

The transition from the plural **καταρτίζετε** to the singular **σκοπῶν** is instructive. The treatment of offenders belonged to the Church collectively, but each member needed to examine himself individually, in order that he might fulfil his part with due humility and sympathy.

Ver. 2. **βαστάζετε.** From its original sense of taking up, this verb acquires the most various meanings, *e.g.*, *carrying* in Matt. xx. 12, *ministration* in Matt. iii. 11, *robbery* in John xii. 6. Here it signifies lending a hand to help by lifting heavy loads. This does not involve transference of the burden, for it is said in 2 Cor. viii. 13, *I mean not that other men be eased and ye burdened:* and in ver. 5 it is added that each will have his own pack to bear; but Christian love must ever be careful to relieve each in turn when overtaxed by crushing loads.

Vv. 3-5. Any conceit of our own strength or goodness is a vain delusion, for we are nothing. Let no man compare his own with others' work: this will only feed his vanity; but let each scrutinise his own work. Then, if he find there ground for rejoicing, it will be in the ability that has been given by God's grace to such a one as he is: for each will have his own burden to bear of conscious guilt and shame.

Ver. 4. **τὸν ἕτερον.** This phrase denotes originally the other of two persons, but in this connexion *another than self*, the world being classified under two heads —*self* and *not self*, so that any other man with whom we are brought into contact belongs to the second division.

Ver. 5. **φορτίον.** This word was applied to the pack usually carried by a porter or a soldier on the march. In Matt. xi. 30 Christ employs this figure to describe the burden which he lays on each of his disciples (**τὸ φορτίον μου**), and here it denotes the regular daily burden laid on Christians. It is necessary to distinguish this from the heavy loads (**βάρη**) to which ver. 2 refers as needing the help of Christian brethren for the relief of overtaxed carriers.

Ver. 6. *Let him that is taught share with him that teacheth.* The word **κοινωνεῖν** contains the key to the true meaning of this verse. Our versions understand it here, and in Rom. xii. 13, Phil. iv. 15, in the sense of *communicating* to others; but I can find no warrant for this in Greek usage. In Rom. xv. 27 it signifies distinctly to *receive* a share, and elsewhere to become a partner (**κοινωνὸς γενέσθαι**) and share in common with others (1 Tim. v. 22, 1 Pet. iv. 13, 2 John 11, Heb. ii. 14). Here in like manner it enjoins upon the leaders of the Churches the duty of admitting all the members to participation in any spiritual blessings they enjoy. It continues, in fact, the protest against the arrogant pretensions and selfish exclusiveness of Judaising leaders.—**ἀγαθοῖς.** It is impossible to restrict this word to mere worldly goods, except where the language of the context suggests or warrants such a restriction, as is the case in Luke xii. 18, xvi. 25. The language here points to the blessings of Christian faith and doctrine.—**κατηχούμενος.** Oral teaching is specified because it was the only form of instruction then existing in the Churches.

Vv. 7-10. GOD'S JUDGMENT IS UNERRING. THOSE WHO SOW EITHER TO THE FLESH OR TO THE SPIRIT SHALL ALIKE REAP THE HARVEST FOR WHICH THEY HAVE SOWN. BUT FAINT NOT IN WELLDOING, FOR WE SHALL IN DUE TIME REAP LIFE ETERNAL.—Ver. 7. **μυκτηρίζεται.** From its original sense of *sneer* this verb was applied in rhetorical language to the betrayal of covert ill-will and contempt by cynical gestures in spite of fair words. There can be no double-

ζεται· ὁ γὰρ ἐὰν σπείρῃ ἄνθρωπος, τοῦτο καὶ θερίσει· 8. ὅτι ὁ σπείρων εἰς τὴν σάρκα ἑαυτοῦ ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς θερίσει φθοράν· ὁ δὲ σπείρων εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος θερίσει ζωὴν αἰώνιον. 9. τὸ δὲ καλὸν ποιοῦντες μὴ ἐγκακῶμεν· καιρῷ γὰρ ἰδίῳ θερίσομεν, μὴ ἐκλυόμενοι. 10. ἄρα οὖν ὡς καιρὸν ἔχομεν, ἐργαζώμεθα τὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς πάντας, μάλιστα δὲ πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους τῆς πίστεως. 11. Ἴδετε πηλίκοις ὑμῖν γράμμασιν ἔγραψα τῇ ἐμῇ χειρί. 12. ὅσοι θέλουσιν εὐπροσωπῆσαι ἐν σαρκί, οὗτοι ἀναγκάζουσιν ὑμᾶς περιτέμνεσθαι, μόνον ἵνα τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μὴ[1] διώκωνται.

[1] μη after Χριστου ℵABCDEF 17, etc.; after ινα FGKL,

dealing with God, for He knows all the thoughts and intents of the heart.

Ver. 8. Every action produces an effect on the character of the actor corresponding as exactly to its motive as the fruit to the seed. If it springs from selfish desire, it stimulates the growth of evil lusts, and issues in a harvest of inward corruption. If, on the contrary, it be done in obedience to the spirit, it quickens spiritual growth, and issues eventually in a harvest of eternal life. The heart of man resembles a field in which he sows, by the mere exercise of his will, a future harvest of good or evil.

Ver. 9. The warnings **μὴ ἐγκακῶμεν** and **μὴ ἐκλυόμενοι** carry on figures borrowed from harvest work: the former depicts husbandmen tempted to slacken their exertions by weariness of prolonged labour, the latter reapers overcome by heat and toil.

Ver. 10. **καιρὸν.** The last verse affirmed that there is a due season for the spiritual harvest as well as the earthly; the same analogy suggests the existence of a spiritual seedtime also, which we are bound to utilise. — **τὸ ἀγαθὸν.** This word varies widely in meaning, like *good* in English; it is applied both to the intrinsic goodness of God Himself (Matt. xix. 17), and to the mere manifestation of a kindly temper towards others. So also its compounds **ἀγαθοποιεῖν, ἀγαθουργεῖν.** The clause **πρὸς πάντας** attaches to it here the latter force: so that the goodness spoken of is goodness to others.—**τ. οἰκείους.** Christians are here designated as *the household of the faith*, and in Eph. ii. 19 as *the household of God.*

Vv. 11-18. The Apostle writes the peroration with his own hand, denouncing the motives of the Pharisaic party, affirming his own absolute reliance on the Cross and the new life of the Spirit, and concluding with a personal appeal and final blessing.—Ver. 11. The Greek text admits but one meaning. The use of the instrumental dative precludes the rendering, *See how large a letter I write*, which would require **πηλίκα γράμματα**: so that the verse obviously calls attention to the large letters employed by the writer from this point onwards. The statement in 2 Thess. iii. 17, that he regularly dictated the body of his Epistles (*cf.* also Rom. xvi. 22), merely attaching his signature by way of attestation, explains this appeal. The size of the letters attested the difficulty which he found in writing with his imperfect sight, and the effort he was now making on their behalf proved his anxiety for the welfare of his Galatian disciples. They were evidently well aware of his infirmity, and needed no explanation of this pathetic allusion to his blindness. It may, therefore, be reasonably read in connexion with iv. 15. Probably the prolonged attack of ophthalmia which had threatened the destruction of his sight had seriously impaired it, and they who had watched his sufferings with such tender sympathy would now be quick to feel for the privation which the attack had entailed upon him. **ἔγραψα**: *I write.* The epistolary aorist is constantly used to denote personal acts of the writer at the time (2 Cor. ix. 3, Eph. vi. 22, Col. iv. 8, Philem. 19, 21).

Vv. 12, 13. Paul impugns the sincerity of the agitators: their affected zeal for the Law was a pretext with a view to disarming Jewish enmity: they urged the circumcision of Gentiles also to gratify their own vanity. They had probably, like the Jewish Christians at Antioch (*cf.* ii. 13), been guilty of inconsistency

13. οὐδὲ γὰρ οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι αὐτοὶ νόμον φυλάσσουσιν· ἀλλὰ θέλουσιν ὑμᾶς περιτέμνεσθαι, ἵνα ἐν τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ σαρκὶ καυχήσωνται. 14. ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχᾶσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· δι' οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται, κἀγὼ τῷ κόσμῳ. 15. ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ οὔτε περιτομή τι ἔστιν,[1] οὔτε ἀκροβυστία, ἀλλὰ καινὴ κτίσις. 16. καὶ ὅσοι τῷ κανόνι τούτῳ στοιχήσουσιν, εἰρήνη ἐπ' αὐτοὺς καὶ ἔλεος, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

[1] εστιν ℵABCDEFG 17, etc.; ισχνει ℵ^{c}D^{c}KLP.

in their practice: but Paul apparently relies also on his argument in ii. 16 that Jewish converts had by the mere act of embracing Christ confessed their own inability to keep the Law, and could not therefore be sincere in preaching to others obedience to its rules.—**τῷ σταυρῷ.** This dative cannot surely mean *for (i.e., by reason of) the cross.* If this had been the meaning, it would have been expressed by **διὰ τὸν σταυρόν.** The correct translation seems to be, *persecuted with the cross, i.e.,* the cross of outward suffering which was in those days the lot of so many converted Jews, and notably of Paul himself. The Cross of Christ is here identified with persecution as it is in Phil iii. 18 with self-denial.

Ver. 13. **περιτεμνόμενοι.** The present participle is more appropriate than the perfect **περιτετμημένοι,** which is read by some MSS.: for the author has in mind the adoption of a system, as in v. 3.

Ver. 14. Paul contrasts his own spirit with that which his rivals are manifesting. They are animated by selfish desires to glory over the flesh of others, he will glory only in the triumph of the cross over his own flesh, whereby the power of the world over him, and his carnal love of the world, are both done away.

Ver. 15. Circumcision is again declared, as in v. 6, to be a mere accident of outward circumstance and of no spiritual import: *faith working in love* was there pronounced essential for Christian life, and here *a new creation,* the birth of the spirit in the heart of man.

Ver. 16. **κανόνι.** Men need a rule to guide their lives as the surveyor or the carpenter for the right adjustment of his work. This rule was supplied to the Jew by the Law in a code of morals, but the Spirit quickens in Christians a new life whereby the conscience is enlightened to discern good and evil for the regulation of their lives.—**καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ:** *yea upon the Israel of God.* **καί** is not properly copulative here, but intensive. Those who walk by the rule of the Spirit are declared to be indeed the true Israel of God, not the Jews who have the name of Israel, but are really only children of Abraham after the flesh.

Ver. 17. **τοῦ λοιποῦ . . .** In deprecating any renewal of the present agitation Paul treats with contempt the prospect of serious danger from it. It had disturbed his peace and the peace of the Church, and must be got rid of, but he describes it as a wearisome annoyance rather than a real peril.—**στίγματα.** These were indelible marks branded on the flesh. They might be self-inflicted: instances are recorded of soldiers branding themselves with the name of their general in token of their absolute devotion to his cause. But they were as a rule inflicted for a badge of lifelong service; the figure in the text is borrowed from the latter, which were either *penal* or *sacred.* The penal were stamped on malefactors, runaway slaves, sometimes on captives; but it is clear from the context that the author has in mind the **στίγματα ἱρά** mentioned by Herodotus in ii., 113, with which the Galatians also were familiar in Phrygian temples. A class of slaves (**ἱερόδουλοι**) attached for life to the service of a temple were branded with the name of the deity. Paul likens himself to these in respect of his lifelong dedication to the name of Jesus, and of the marks imprinted on his body, by which he was sealed for a servant of Jesus in perpetuity. These were doubtless the scars left by Jewish scourging, by the stones of Lystra and the Roman rods at Philippi, all tokens of faithful service to his Master in which he gloried.

Ver. 18. **μετὰ τ. πνεύματος.** This form of the final blessing occurs also in 2 Tim. iv. 22 and Philemon 25, but not elsewhere: it was probably suggested

17. Τοῦ λοιποῦ, κόπους μοι μηδεὶς παρεχέτω· ἐγὼ γὰρ τὰ στίγματα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ[1] ἐν τῷ σώματί μου βαστάζω. 18. Ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοί. ἀμήν·

Πρὸς Γαλάτας.[2]

[1] Ιησου ABC[1] 17; Κυριου Ιησου C[3]D[3]EKL; **K. I. Χριστου** ℵ.

[2] **προς γαλατας** ℵABC 6, 17, 135; add **ετελεσθη** FG; add **επληρωθη** DE; add **εγραφη απο Ρωμης** KP 47.

here by the stress laid on the life of the Spirit in the Epistle.

The subscription **ἀπὸ Ῥώμης** is neither genuine nor correct. Its absence in the oldest MSS. stamps it as an addition of later date. The Epistle was evidently written before the Roman captivity (see Introduction, pp. 144-7).

APPENDIX A.

PAULINE CHRONOLOGY.

The Apostolic Council forms a central landmark in the Christian life of Paul between his conversion and his Roman imprisonment, dividing the interval into two unequal portions. The length of the earlier is computed in Gal. ii. 1 at fourteen years; but this may not imply a total of more than thirteen; for the broken years at the beginning and end are both included separately in that total. The three first of these were spent in Damascus, except a brief sojourn in Arabia, according to Gal. i. 18: the remainder in or around Tarsus and Antioch, with the exception of one brief visit to Jerusalem for the conveyance of alms, and a subsequent mission with Barnabas to Cyprus and Asia Minor. The visit to Jerusalem was too uneventful to call for notice in the Epistle. Its incidental connection with the history of Herod Agrippa determines its date: Herod reigned from 41 to 44; his persecution of the Church occurred not long before his death, and had already begun when the envoys arrived at Jerusalem. The joint mission occupied at least two years, probably much more; its success established the position of Barnabas and Paul throughout the Church as Apostles to the Gentiles, and led to the controversy in regard to circumcision which was settled by the Apostolic Council at Jerusalem; evidently no long time intervened between its termination and the Council. From that time forward the continuous narrative of events in the Acts furnishes material for dating approximately the successive stages of Paul's apostolic career. He and Barnabas returned at once from Jerusalem to Antioch, and many Christians gathered there from Jerusalem, including Peter and others whose names are mentioned. The length of their sojourn in Antioch and the neighbouring Churches cannot be determined with precision, as it is not known at what season the Council took place; if at the beginning of winter, they must have remained there the whole winter; if near the end, perhaps only a few weeks. In either case it is certain that neither Barnabas nor Paul started

before spring, for the navigation of the Levant and the passes of Mount Taurus between Cilicia and Galatia were alike closed in winter to ordinary travellers. The amount of time spent in the second visit to the Galatian Churches, in Macedonia, at Athens, and on the way to Corinth, is uncertain, but exceeded half a year at the lowest computation, and the Corinthian ministry cannot have fallen far short of two years, as it embraced several Sabbaths in the synagogue, eighteen months in the house of Justus, and a further indefinite sojourn (*yet many days*) in the city. It may be presumed, as he hastened from Cenchreæ to Jerusalem to complete his vow and keep the feast there, that he arrived before Pentecost, about the same season that he departed from Antioch on his travels; so that the interval was about three years in all. Another period of three years carries on the history to the end of the Ephesian ministry; it includes first a journey from Jerusalem to Ephesus, in the course of which he *spent some time* in Antioch and went over all the Galatian country in order, then three months' ministry in the synagogue, and two years in the school of Tyrannus, and ends about Pentecost (1 Cor. xvi. 8). Another year brought the Apostle to Jerusalem, after visiting the Macedonian and Corinthian Churches. His imprisonment—first at Jerusalem, then at Cæsarea during the last two years of the government of Felix and the first part of the rule of Festus, and lastly on the way to Rome—accounts for nearly three years more, making a period of ten years in all between his departure from Antioch on his second mission-journey and his arrival in Rome.

A valuable clue for determining the date of that event is supplied by the history of Felix. His recall took place a short time before the departure of Paul from Cæsarea. He was followed by a hostile deputation from Cæsarea complaining of his misgovernment; but apparently there had not been time to organise and despatch it before navigation closed for the winter, otherwise the Roman Jews would have heard of Paul's appeal to Cæsar (*cf.* Acts xxviii. 21); so that Felix was still awaiting his trial at Rome. Now it is pretty certain that Felix retained the government of Judæa for the first five years after the accession of Nero, in spite of the disgrace of his brother Pallas at the imperial court—as long, in short, as Burrhus and Seneca dictated the policy of the empire, and was not recalled before 59. In spite of his cruelty and extortion he retained the confidence of Burrhus to the last, perhaps by the vigour of his government, perhaps from personal motives; and it was probably the support of Burrhus even more than the wealth of Pallas which

secured his acquittal at Rome; for Burrhus procured from the emperor, as the result of the enquiry, the disfranchisement of the Jewish citizens of Cæsarea who had impugned the conduct of Felix, and the systematic adoption of a rigorous policy for the repression of Jewish sedition. As the death of Burrhus took place in February, 62, the trial of Felix cannot have been later than 61. I conclude, therefore, that his recall took place either in 59 or 60, and that Paul reached Rome early in 60 or 61. If Prof. Ramsay is right in his contention (*Expositor*, vol. iii., 1896, p. 336), that the voyage of Paul to Palestine took place in 57, this is a decisive confirmation of the earlier date. Reckoning back ten years we arrive at the spring of 50 or 51 for the date of Paul's departure with Silas from Antioch. If the earlier date be assumed, I take it that the Apostolic Council was held some weeks earlier in 50; if the latter be preferred, I am disposed to date the Apostolic Council late in 50, and to conclude that the winter of 50-51 was spent in Antioch or its neighbourhood. Either reckoning leads to the choice of 37 for the year of the conversion, according to the computation made in Gal. ii. 1.

It is true that most critics favour the adoption of an earlier date than 37 for the conversion, but chiefly (as I think) because so little is known of the years immediately following the first Pentecost. It seems to me, on the contrary, probable that several years of silent growth intervened before the disciples were strong enough in their faith to establish themselves in Jerusalem and face the persecution of the rulers; and I find in the Acts many indications of a considerable interval. But it is enough here to compare the history of the first great persecution of the Church, which gave occasion for the conversion of Saul, with the particular circumstances of the year 37 recorded in Josephus which impress on me the conviction that the conversion occurred in that year. The narrative of Acts vi.-ix. exhibits a remarkable series of events:—

1. Stephen was indicted for blasphemy, and after a regular trial before the Jewish authorities was condemned by acclamation, carried without the walls, and stoned to death in strict accordance with the procedure of the Mosaic Law.

2. This was followed by domiciliary visits to the houses of Christians, who were arrested, imprisoned, and condemned to death by the Jewish authorities, Saul himself giving his vote against them (Acts xxvi. 10). A sudden reign of terror prevailed for a short time in Jerusalem; and then ceased as suddenly, leaving the Apostles once more free to come and go preaching the faith.

3. The Sanhedrim were able to give Saul authority to bring Christians from the province of Syria outside Judæa bound to Jerusalem for trial.

Historians have with some reason questioned the possibility of such proceedings as these in a Roman province: for the imperial government maintained with the utmost jealousy its exclusive prerogative of life and death over its subjects throughout the empire; the extreme violence of religious factions made the enforcement of this principle more essential in Judæa than elsewhere, and the repeated but futile efforts of the Sanhedrim to procure the death of Paul, first by assassination, then by judicial sentence of the Roman governor, exemplify at once their impotence for the infliction of capital punishment, and the vital importance of Roman protection to the Apostolic Church. It is true that one other noted Christian, James the brother of the Lord, was stoned to death, like Stephen: but that was an isolated act of mob violence during an interregnum, instigated by a fanatical high-priest, and promptly punished as an outrage on Roman authority.

The most striking parallel to the trial of Stephen is presented by that of his Divine Master. Both alike were found guilty of blasphemy, partly on the evidence of witnesses, partly on their own confession of faith. But when the Sanhedrim appealed to Pilate for confirmation of the sentence, he met the appeal with bitter scorn, challenging them in derision of their impotence to carry out themselves the sentence of death which they had presumed to pronounce upon the prisoner. This was indeed no solitary instance of the haughty and arrogant spirit which Pilate displayed throughout his administration. For many years he continued to earn the hatred of the Jews by his imperious temper and excessive severity. It is utterly incredible that intolerable outrages on Roman authority, like the public stoning of Stephen and judicial murders of other Christians at Jerusalem, can have occurred under the government of Pilate. Now that government lasted ten years, and only came to an end by his deposition in the year 37. His removal made way for new rulers and new measures in Judæa, for the Emperor Tiberius, having then become involved in war with Aretas owing to the quarrel between that king and Herod Antipas, had commissioned Vitellius proconsul of Syria to lead an expedition into Arabia and attack him in his capital Petra. As this force had to march across Judæa and make it the base of operations, Vitellius was invested with supreme authority in that country. The support of the Jewish nation became indispensable for his

success, and Vitellius, a supple and unscrupulous courtier, afterwards notorious as the basest sycophant at the imperial court, left no stone unturned to win their favour. He at once dismissed Pilate in disgrace,[1] remitted obnoxious taxes, rescinded unpopular regulations, and repaired in person to Jerusalem to curry favour by feasts and sacrifices while his army was on the march. We know from Josephus that his most ostentatious and successful display of sympathy with the Jews was the restoration of the sacred vestments to the custody of the priesthood, which his predecessors had hitherto retained in their own hands with jealous care as a hostage for Jewish loyalty, and that he bestowed the office of high priest on a son of Annas the powerful head of the priestly oligarchy. That oligarchy had by that time conceived the same jealous hatred against the disciples of Christ as against their master; and an unscrupulous governor like Vitellius could find no cheaper means of gratifying them than the surrender of an unpopular sect to their will. The martyrdom of Christians by Jewish zealots for the Law became in short as natural under the circumstances as it was contrary to the imperial principle of religious toleration, and had been inconceivable under Pilate. The presence again of Vitellius in Jerusalem suggests a reasonable explanation of the mission to Damascus, which could hardly have been undertaken without express sanction from the proconsul.

Finally, the circumstances of the year 37 completely explain the rapid termination of the reign of terror in the Church. For about Pentecost Vitellius received tidings of the emperor's death, and being personally disposed to side with Aretas against Herod Antipas, he at once abandoned the expedition, and gladly returned to Antioch. From the day of Tiberius' decease no motive remained for courting Jewish favour: the new reign brought with it in fact an entire reversal of Roman policy in these regions; the Church enjoyed once more comparative peace under the shelter of Roman indifference; and before long the threats of Caius Cæsar to erect his own statue in the temple of God turned the thoughts of the Jews from attacks on the Christian religion to the defence of their own. There is in short one period, and one only, in the Roman government of Judæa during which the martyrdom of Stephen and many other Christians in Jerusalem was either probable or feasible, and that is the first half of the year 37.

[1] The date of Pilate's deposition and of the subsequent events is fixed with some precision by the time of his arrival in Rome: though he hastened thither according to his instructions, he did not arrive before the death of Tiberius on 16th March, 37 (*Jos. Ant.*, xviii., iv., 2).

APPENDIX B.

COMPARISON OF THE ROMAN WITH THE GALATIAN EPISTLE.

The position of Paul toward the Roman Church differed widely from that which he held in regard to the Galatian, and his attitude in the two Epistles differs accordingly. He had the strongest possible claim on the loyalty of the Galatians, for he had spent months in founding and establishing each of the Churches, had recently visited them afresh, and wrote for the express purpose of checking a threatened revolt against his Gospel and his authority. He was, on the contrary, still a stranger to Rome, had no personal experience of their actual condition or special temptations, and no more claim on their allegiance than on any other converted Gentiles. He was, indeed, deeply interested in the welfare of the Church, and had perhaps commissioned Aquila and Priscilla with others of his own disciples to proceed thither and prepare the way for his own intended visit; but the original foundation of the Roman Church was probably due to others. Under these circumstances the coincidence between certain chapters of the two Epistles is remarkable. If it were limited to the expression of certain eternal truths like the antagonism of flesh and spirit, and that love is the fulfilment of the Law, the correspondence might reasonably be expected. But it extends to the quotation and application of the same texts, and to the conclusions founded on them. Both adduce the same Scriptural arguments to uphold justification by faith alone against legal righteousness. Both associate the adoption and inheritance of the sons of God in Christ with His ancient promises to Abraham and his seed. Both alike restrict the function of Law to the condemnation and punishment of sin, and contrast its bondage with the freedom of the Gospel in corresponding language. Lightfoot argues from this coincidence that the two Epistles approximated in date, in spite of the wide divergence in their general tenor. But the coincidence is distinctly

limited in its scope: it is very striking wherever the author is dealing with the doctrinal questions at issue between Judaism and Christianity and is scarcely perceptible elsewhere. The limitation is instructive, for it suggests that the author had made these subjects and the passages of the Old Testament which bear upon them an habitual topic of controversy with Jewish teachers in the synagogue. This view is borne out by comparison of the language used by other authors. Even the Epistle of James, widely different as are his lessons on the subject of faith and works, bases them on the same text as these Epistles, "Abraham believed God and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness". Why was this? Because the blessing of Abraham, his faith and his righteousness were prevailing topics in the religious teaching of his day. Philo likewise refers constantly to the same passages of Scripture and bases his arguments upon them. Now, what had been the antecedents of Paul before and after his conversion? Educated in Jerusalem at the feet of Gamaliel, he had been a zealot for the Law, and a sincere believer in the teaching of the Pharisees. After growing up to manhood in this faith, he had for fourteen years before he wrote the Galatian Epistle been engaged in perpetual controversy with his former teachers, encountering in every synagogue the same objections, and combating them with similar arguments. Inevitably his thoughts and language on such subjects as the blessing of Abraham, faith and works, the Law and the Gospel, had become in a measure stereotyped; and in addressing former disciples of the synagogue, whether in Galatia or in Rome, he fell almost unconsciously into identical language and trains of thought.

The close analogy, however, of the two Epistles in certain parts serves to bring out in stronger relief their wide divergence in spirit and substance. The Galatian Epistle was evoked by an insidious attack on the Christian freedom of Greek Churches, and its tone is thoroughly controversial. It insists on the futility of seeking justification by obedience to the Law, it urges that Jewish Christians have all confessed themselves guilty sinners, and owe to Christ their redemption from the curses of the Law; it establishes the provisional character of the Sinaitic dispensation, and reduces it to a mere preparatory discipline designed for an age of spiritual childhood and wholly unfit for Christians, seeing they have attained to spiritual manhood; it dwells on the bondage of Israel after the flesh, and identifies unbelieving Jews with Ishmael in their present temper and future destiny. In the Roman Epistle we breathe a different atmosphere. It is a comprehensive exposition of Christian

faith and duty addressed to the central Church of the Empire from the standpoint of an Apostle who claims the right to promulgate a new law in the name of Christ for the whole Roman world; it insists on the universal sinfulness of Jew and Gentile alike; like the Galatian it accepts Abraham as father of the faithful, but is careful to add that he is so not of the circumcision only but also of the uncircumcision; it is not content to pass over God's earlier dealings with mankind before Abraham and to identify Christ with the seed of Abraham, but goes back to the Fall, and describes him as the second Adam redeeming the whole race from the dominion of sin and death; it does not borrow its idea of law, like the Galatian Epistle, from the Mosaic, but develops the conception of an universal law of conscience even in the heathen world which maintains perpetual conflict with the law of sin and death in our members.

The reader can hardly fail to recognise in the changed attitude of the Apostle his altered position, and the transformation that he had been instrumental in effecting in Greece and Asia between the dates of the two Epistles. The earlier is animated throughout with the spirit of conflict, and vividly recalls the period when Paul was earnestly battling for the spiritual life of his Gospel against the surviving spirit of Judaism within the Church. But when he wrote from Corinth to the Roman Church, on the eve of his departure, having no more place in those parts, the issue of the conflict had been virtually settled by the wonderful expansion of the Greek Churches, Judaism had lost its hold, and the independence of the Christian Church no longer admitted of a doubt. Hence the Apostle does not hesitate to write of the national rejection of Israel as an accomplished fact, deeply as he deplored it, and earnestly as he craved for their restoration to a due share in their inheritance and a place in the body of Christ. The Roman Epistle belongs, in short, to a distinctly later stage in the history of the Church than the Galatian. Its decisive inclusion of Jew and Gentile in one category, its identification of Law with the conscience of mankind, its comprehensive scheme of Christian legislation, based on the eternal principles of righteousness, truth and love, its maturity of Christian thought, proved that the Apostle had passed beyond the earlier stage of controversy with Judaism into a region of spiritual conflict with evils of faith and practice, and grasping the conception of a universal religion had braced himself to meet its demand for a new Law and a new life of the Spirit in Christ.

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO THE

EPHESIANS

INTRODUCTION

1. Ephesus. The city with which this sublime Epistle is traditionally associated had a notable name in the ancient Greek world. A remarkable place belongs to it also in the history of the origins of the Christian Church. It emerges far back in pre-Christian times, and the glimpses which we get of it from point to point in the course of its fortunes show us things of great and varied interest. Its rise into an importance which became world-wide, its achievements during the palmy period of its prosperity and power, the changes through which it passed from the days of its pre-eminence in Asia Minor on to its destruction by the Goths and its miserable survival in the insignificant modern village of Ayasaluk make an impressive story. Its inhabitants were drawn from various sources, Hellenic and Oriental. It was one of the chief centres of the Ionian settlers. But we are told of strangers who occupied the place or its neighbourhood long before the Ionian immigration. These are referred to by Pausanias (vii., 26), who speaks of them as Carians ; but some modern scholars suppose them to have been Hittites (*cf.* article "Ephesus" in *Encyc. Biblica*). The city was colonised mostly from Athens, and something of the Athenian genius may be recognised in its people. But it is clear that it had a large infusion of Asiatic elements.

In ancient times Ephesus was a place of commanding commercial importance. It owed this not less to its geographical position than to the energy and enterprise of its people. No Greek city in Asia Minor was more advantageously planted. It stood at the meeting point of roads which carried trade with them and converged on the great line of communication between the East and the metropolis of the world. It was the chief city of one of the four great river valleys that penetrated Asia Minor, being to the Caÿster what Miletus was to the Meander, Pergamus to the Caïcus, and Smyrna to the Hermus. The most important of the Asiatic trade routes and great lines of intercourse between Rome and the East was the one that passed up

by the Meander and the Lycus to Laodicea and Apamea. This being so, the commercial supremacy was held by Miletus for a length of time, the road which was commanded by it having the advantage of being shorter and less difficult than that to which Ephesus was the key. But under the operation of influences which we can only partially trace things changed in the later period of the Greek sovereignty, and under the Romans Ephesus had the place which had once belonged to Miletus. It gained largely by the decline of other great commercial cities. The overthrow of Smyrna by the Lydians about B.C. 525 and that of Miletus by the Persians in B.C. 494 contributed much to its ascendency. Thus it came about that during the Roman Empire it ranked with Antioch and Alexandria as one of the three great emporia of the trade of the Eastern Mediterranean, and formed the commercial capital for the wide and varied territory west of the Cilician gates. It rose to the dignity of metropolis of the Roman Province of Asia. It was a free city. It had an "assembly" and "council" of its own, and a governor, or pro-consul, ἀνθύπατος (*cf.* Acts xix. 38). In the general and natural decay of popular government, however, under the Imperial system, power fell into the hands of officials, and in Ephesus the γραμματεύς, the "town-clerk" (Acts xix. 35) or "recorder," was the great authority.

Ephesus was originally a sea-port. It stood on the left bank of the Caÿster, it is true, a few miles up from the sea, but for a length of time the channel of the river was carefully attended to and kept open. It was never an easy task, however, to maintain a clear way between the harbour and the sea. The quantity of silt deposited by the Caÿster was great. Blundering engineering, undertaken in the second half of the second century B.C. under Attalus II. Philadelphus, made matters worse. By Paul's time the passage had got into such a condition that, though the city still retained its pre-eminence, mariners avoided Ephesus if they could. A serious attempt to improve the channel was made by the Governor of Asia, as Tacitus informs us (*Ann.*, xvi., 23), about A.D. 65. But effort slackened again, and things were left to take their course. The result in course of time was that the once famous harbour became a troublesome marsh. Ephesus ceased to be a sea-port, its trade declined, and the life went out of the city.

The importance of Ephesus, however, in ancient times was not due to its commercial position alone. It had a considerable name as a school of art. The great painters Parrhasius of the fifth century B.C. and Apelles of the fourth belonged to the city. Above all,

it was a place of paramount religious interest. It was the centre of the worship of the goddess who was known among the Greeks as Artemis and among the Romans as Diana. The temple erected in her honour was one of the seven wonders of the ancient world, a splendid structure of shining marble, stated by Pliny (*Nat. Hist.*, xvi., 40, 213) to have been 425 feet long and 220 wide (but by Mr. J. T. Wood to have measured 343 feet by 164), with 127 columns some 60 feet high. It is reported to have taken about 220 years to finish. In it was treasured an image of the goddess which was believed to have fallen from heaven in remote times. Behind the shrine was the "treasury," which was the bank of Asia. The temple was destroyed by the Goths in A.D. 262.

Magnificent as the temple was, it was not the only architectural wonder possessed by Ephesus. There was the great theatre, on the west side of Mount Coressus, a vast structure, the largest Greek theatre in Asia Minor and in the ancient Greek world, reputed to accommodate 50,000 spectators. North of it was the *stadium*, where races were run and wild beast fights were conducted. It was the temple, however, that made the chief glory of the city. It was the temple that added more than anything else to its importance. The chief boast of Ephesus was the title of νεωκόρος, or "temple-warden" (literally "temple-sweeper"), rendered "worshipper" in Acts xix. 35 by the AV, and "temple-keeper" by the RV. It is true that the title was more usually given to Asiatic cities as wardens of temples of the Imperial worship, and Ephesus was νεωκόρος first of one temple, then of two, and later still even of three. But an inscription of the second century and coins of the third bear witness to the fact stated in Acts xix. 35 that Ephesus had the title of Warden of the Temple of Diana (*cf.* Prof. Ramsay's article on "Ephesus" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*). This vast temple was not the only sacred structure that found a place on the slopes of the hill which made the original religious centre. Here was built the great Christian Church which was dedicated by Justinian to St. John the Evangelist. Here, too, at a later date, was erected the mosque which is reported to have been one of the best specimens of Arabian-Persian art.

2. The Church in Ephesus. It is with the great names of Paul and John that the story of the primitive Christian community in Ephesus is specially associated, both in the New Testament itself and in tradition. John's connection with the Ephesian Church belongs to the latter part of the first century. We have every reason to believe that, after the destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersion

of the members of the mother Church, that Apostle made Ephesus his home. The historian Eusebius speaks of his residence there, and reports certain interesting occurrences which took place during his stay. Other names known to us in the sacred history have also certain associations with the Ephesian Church. One of these is that of Timothy, who appears to have been commissioned by Paul towards the end of his career to do some special work in Ephesus. In 1 Timothy (i. 3) the Apostle is represented as reminding this his "own son in the faith" that he had besought him to abide "still in Ephesus," while he himself went into Macedonia, that he might "charge some that they teach no other doctrine". It may also be inferred from what is said of John Mark in different passages of the New Testament (Col. iv. 10; 1 Peter v. 13; 2 Timothy iv. 11) that he too had not a little to do with the Churches of Asia; and that being so, it can well be understood that he was known to the Church of Ephesus and visited the city in his journeyings. It has been supposed by some that the Evangelist Luke also had some connection with Ephesus. But there is no historical foundation for this. Mr. J. T. Wood indeed takes the name borne by the modern village which represents the ancient Ephesus to be a corruption of αγιος λουκας, "St. Luke". But Ayasaluk or Ayassaluk appears to be a corruption of Ayo-theolog, Ayo-tholog, αγιος θεολογος, the name being taken from the Church of St. John built there by Justinian.

It is with Paul himself, therefore, that the beginnings of the Church of Ephesus are associated. Men from Asia were among the multitudes in Jerusalem who heard the Apostles speak with tongues on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii. 9), and it is possible that the first tidings of the new faith may have been carried by some of these to the capital of the Province. But of that there is no record. The testimony of the Book of Acts is that Paul, at the beginning of his second great missionary journey, after he had gone throughout Phrygia and the region of Galatia, was "forbidden of the Holy Ghost" to preach the word in Asia (xvi. 6); but that at the close of that journey, when he was on his way from Greece to Syria, he did visit Ephesus and "reasoned with the Jews in the synagogue". That he made some impression on this occasion appears from the fact that he was asked to stay. This he could not do, because he had to press on to Jerusalem to keep the feast there. But he left Aquila and Priscilla in Ephesus and promised himself to return (Acts xviii. 19-21). To this brief visit of the Apostle of the Gentiles, followed up by the efforts of Aquila and Priscilla, the planting of a Christian Church in the capital of the Province of Asia appears to be due. When

Paul was away in Syria and Asia (Acts xviii. 22, 23) something further was effected in another way. Apollos came to Ephesus, knowing only of the baptism of John. He had the way of God expounded to him more fully by the two devoted friends whom Paul had left behind him in Ephesus. The result was that, understanding better as he now did the fulfilment of the promised Messianic salvation, he "mightily convinced the Jews, and *that* publicly, showing by the scriptures that Jesus was Christ" (Acts xviii. 24-28). After Apollos had passed on to Corinth Paul returned, as he had undertaken to do, to Ephesus (Acts xix. 1). On this occasion his stay was a protracted one, extending over more than two years and three months (Acts xix. 8, 10), or as he expressed it in round numbers in his address to the elders at Miletus "by the space of three years" (Acts xx. 31).

First he devoted himself to the instruction of certain disciples who had been baptised only unto John's baptism and knew nothing of the Holy Ghost (Acts xix. 1-7). Then for three months he spoke of the things of the Kingdom of God to the Jews in the synagogue. In this he had only partial success, and soon he had to encounter bitter opposition. He gave up his appeal, therefore, to the Jews, and took the school of "Tyrannus," in which he "disputed daily" for the space of two years. He did this with such result that he turned many from the practice of the magical arts which were in great favour in Ephesus, and "all they which dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks" (Acts xix. 10, 20). In other words, the report of the Gospel which Paul preached penetrated through the Province, being carried no doubt to the great cities by travellers who visited Ephesus, and by missionaries or messengers like Epaphras. And for the purpose of disseminating the knowledge of the new faith through the Asiatic Province, Ephesus was not less singularly fitted by its geographical position and commercial communications than was Antioch for Syria or Rome for the further West. The tumultuous opposition, however, which was roused by Demetrius against Paul as a destroyer of the silversmith's craft and a subverter of the worship of Diana, brought his work in Ephesus to a close and compelled him to hasten his departure into Greece (Acts xix. 21—xx. 1). During his last voyage to Syria he did not visit Ephesus itself; but, touching at Miletus, he sent for the elders of the Ephesian Church and took his pathetic farewell of them there (Acts xx. 17-38).

So far as the Book of Acts is concerned, that is the last glimpse we get of Paul in his connection with Ephesus. In the Pastoral

Epistles, however, we have some further references to Ephesus and to Paul's care for the Church there. In 1 Timothy (i. 3), as we have seen, we find that Timothy had been placed in the city with a view to the preservation of sound doctrine, and that Paul desired him to remain there when he himself went into Macedonia; and in 2 Timothy mention is made both of the way in which Onesiphorus ministered to Paul in Ephesus (i. 18), and of the fact that Tychicus was sent by Paul to Ephesus (iv. 12). The relations, therefore, between Paul and this Church were of the closest and most confidential kind. As to the composition of the Christian community, it appears to have included from the first both Jews and Greeks (Acts xix. 1-10, xx. 21). The Gentile element, however, seems to have been the larger and to have grown more and more, so that the Epistle deals with the Church as practically a Gentile-Christian body.

In 1 Peter (i. 1) those in Asia, including doubtless the members of the metropolitan Church, are named among the strangers scattered throughout various lands, towards whom the writer has a certain responsibility and to whom he addresses his Epistle. In the Apocalypse which bears the name of John, the Church of Ephesus appears among the seven Churches of Asia to which John's message is directed; and that the Ephesian Church was recognised as the chief of the seven may be inferred perhaps from the fact that it has the first place in the list and in the address (i. 11, ii. 1). It is also with John that tradition connects the Ephesian Church after Paul's decease. Of its later history, it is enough to say that it long retained its importance among the Churches, and that, among other things, it was the seat of one of the great Œcumenical Councils (A.D. 431), and also of the notorious Robber-Synod (A.D. 440).

3. The Epistle—its General Character, Contents and Plan. Among the Epistles bearing the name of St. Paul there is none greater than this, nor any with a character more entirely its own. There have been students, it is true, who with an almost incredible lack of insight have considered it an insipid production or a tedious and unskilful compilation. Among these must be named even so acute a scholar as De Wette. Such pronouncements, however, belong to the failures and eccentricities of criticism, and count for little. With few exceptions scholars of all different schools who have studied and interpreted this Epistle have been at one in regarding it as one of the sublimest and most profound of all the New Testament writings. In the judgment of many who are well entitled to deliver an opinion, it is the grandest of all the Pauline letters. There is a peculiar and sustained loftiness in its teaching which has deeply

impressed the greatest minds and has earned for it the title of the "Epistle of the Ascension". It tarries largely among "the heavenlies," and lifts us into the eternities *a parte ante* and *a parte post*. It is characterised by a dignity and a serenity which are entirely in harmony with the elevation of its thoughts. It takes little to do either with the questions of ceremonialism or with the personal vindications which fill so large a space in others of the greater Epistles of St. Paul. The polemical element is conspicuous by its absence. There is scarcely even an echo of the great controversies which ring so loudly in the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians. If they were still active in any measure or at all in the writer's view when he addressed himself to these Asiatic Churches, they are not on the surface at least of this majestic Epistle. The nearest approach to any explicit allusion to such things is in what is said in a single verse (chap. ii. 11) regarding the Circumcision and the Uncircumcision.

There is a remarkable cohesion, too, in the composition, part fitting in with part naturally and without effort. In its structure the Epistle is an unmistakable unity. The whole argument moves round a few great ideas. The plan is simple. The Epistle opens and closes in the usual Pauline way, and it divides naturally into two great sections, one doctrinal and the other practical or hortatory. There is first the usual inscription or greeting (i. 1, 2), followed by a thanksgiving which takes the form of a solemn ascription of praise to God for the spiritual blessings enjoyed by the writer and his readers. The mention of these blessings develops into a doctrinal statement which deals with the lofty themes of election, predestination, redemption and the forgiveness of sins; the mystery of the Divine will; the grace of the Holy Spirit as seal and earnest; the power of God in the resurrection and exaltation of Christ; the sovereignty of Christ over the world and His Headship over the Church; the Divine quickening of the spiritually dead; the abrogation of the Law that formed the wall of partition between Jew and Gentile; the love of Christ and His indwelling in the believer. Each of these great themes leads easily to the next. In the course of their exposition the Apostle enlarges especially on the ultimate purpose of God to sum up all things in Christ (i. 9-11); the relation in which Christ stands to the universe and to the Church (i. 20-23); the absolutely gracious character of the salvation, the new life, and the gifts bestowed upon believers by God (ii. 1-10); the revelation and fulfilment of the purpose of God, hidden for ages, to make the Gentile partaker with the Jew (ii. 11-22); and the marvel of the grace that has established equality and unity where once there were privilege and separation

(iii. 1-19). This first of the two primary divisions of the Epistle concludes with a doxology, which again celebrates that gracious power of God which works all for us and within us.

As the doctrinal section occupies the first three chapters, the hortatory section extends over the last three. These chapters are taken up with practical matters—the necessity of a walk in harmony with the Divine call; the commendation of humility, meekness, forbearance, concord, peace and all good brotherly relations; the duty of growing in likeness to Christ and in obedience to Him; the forsaking of all heathen vices; the practice of truthfulness and honesty, abstinence from all corrupt communications, from all bitterness and wrath and evil-speaking and malice; sedulous watchfulness against any falling back into easy compliance with the two characteristic pagan forms of moral evil, sensuality and greed, or into any slackness in the sense of their deep sinfulness; the reverent regard of the Christian relations between husband and wife, parents and children, masters and slaves, and the careful observance of the duties arising out of the Christian idea of these relations; the need for the full spiritual equipment provided by God for the withstanding of all evil. These various ethical requirements and recommendations are presented as all having their roots in the great facts and doctrines of grace which are expounded in the former division of the Epistle, and as all growing up out of that soil. In their enforcement special prominence is given to the maintenance of concord and peace in the Church (iv. 4); the great object which all Christian gifts are meant to serve (iv. 12-16); the forswearing of all sins of uncleanness as things wholly alien to the Christian life (v. 3-14); the sacredness of the primary domestic and relative duties, those above all pertaining to the relations of husband and wife (v. 22—vi. 1-9); the seriousness of the Christian's warfare and the sufficiency of the Christian's armour (vi. 10-18). The Epistle is brought to its close by some personal references bearing on the writer's requirements and commission (vi. 19, 20); a brief notice of the mission of Tychicus (vi. 21, 22); and a final salutation or benediction, which is given in terms of grace and peace (vi. 23, 24).

In the course of thought thus followed out in the Epistle there are certain great ideas that have peculiar prominence given them. Of these the largest is that of the Divine *grace*—the term χάρις occurring under one aspect or another some thirteen times. Another is that of "the heavenlies," which has an entirely peculiar place and application in this Epistle. Much, too, is made of the conceptions of the Divine *fulness* (πλήρωμα); the *mystery* (μυστήριον); the *economy*

(οἰκονομία); the spiritual *understanding* (γνῶσις, ἐπίγνωσις, σοφία, σύνεσις, φρόνησις) proper to the Christian and in which he is to increase. There are also the ideas of *union* and *unity*, union with Christ, union and fellowship one with another, the unity of the Church, the oneness of Jew and Gentile, the unity in the diversity of gifts, the unity of the faith. These great conceptions run through the Epistle, and express themselves in such compound forms as συνεζωποίησε, συνήγειρε, συνεκάθισεν, συμπολῖται, συγκληρονόμοι, συναρμολογουμένη, συνοικοδομεῖσθε, σύσσωμος.

The Epistle is remarkable also for the use which it makes of a series of terms of far-reaching significance, which belong to the very essence of its thought and nowhere get the place and the iteration which they have here, except in some measure in the Epistle to the Romans. Among these are the *counsel* (βουλή) of God, His *will* (θέλημα), His *purpose* (πρόθεσις), His good-pleasure (εὐδοκία), His *foreordaining* or *pre-determining* (προορίζειν), His *afore preparing* (προετοιμάζειν), etc.

The vocabulary of the Epistle also is singular and full of interest. The letter contains a number of words and phrases which are peculiar to itself and the sister Epistle to the Colossians, so far as the New Testament writings are concerned—such as ἀνθρωποπάρεσκος, ἀφή, ἀποκαταλλάσσειν, ἀπαλλοτριοῦσθαι, αὔξειν, and its noun αὔξησις, ὀφθαλμοδουλεία, ῥιζοῦν, συζωοποιεῖν, συμβιβάζειν, ἐκ ψυχῆς. It has others which are confined to itself and certain others of the Pauline Epistles: ἀγαθωσύνη, ἀληθεύειν, ἀνεξιχνίαστος, ἐπιχορηγία, εὔνοια, εὐωδία, θάλπειν, κάμπτειν, περικεφαλαία, πλεονέκτης, ποίημα, πρεσβεύειν, προετοιμάζειν, προσαγωγή, προτίθεσθαι, υἱοθεσία, ὑπερβάλλειν, ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ.

On the other hand, there are a good many words which occur in this Epistle alone of all claiming to be by Paul, although they are found occasionally elsewhere in the New Testament, such as ἄγνοια, ἀγρυπνεῖν, ἀκρογωνιαῖος, ἀμφότεροι, ἄνεμος, ἀνιέναι, ἅπας, ἀπειλή, εὔσπλαγχνος, μακράν, ὀργίζεσθαι, ὁσιότης, ὀσφύς, πανοπλία, πάροικος, περιζωννύναι, πλάτος, ποιμήν, in the sense of *pastor*, πολιτεία, σαπρός, σπῖλος, συγκαθίζειν, σωτήριον, ὕδωρ, ὑποδεῖσθαι, ὕψος, φραγμός, φρόνησις, χαριτοῦν, χειροποίητος. Some of these obviously are of small moment. Others have some significance. On these lists see Abbot's *Crit. and Exeg. Comm. on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians*, and more especially Holtzmann's *Einleitung* and *Kritik der Epheser- und Kolosser-Briefe*. In addition to these we have a considerable list of pure ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, including ἄθεος, αἰσχρότης, αἰχμαλωτεύειν, ἀνανεόω, ἄνοιξις, ἀπαλγεῖν, ἄσοφος, βέλος, ἐκτρέφω, ἐλαχιστότερος, ἑνότης, ἐξισχύειν, ἐπιδύειν, ἐπιφαύσκειν, ἑτοιμασία, εὔνοια, εὐτραπελία, ὁ ἠγαπημένος, as applied to

Christ, θυρεός, καταρτισμός, κατώτερος, κληροῦν, κλυδωνίζεσθαι, κοσμοκράτωρ, κρυφῇ, κυβεία, μακροχρόνιος, μέγεθος, μεθοδεία, μεσότοιχον, μωρολογία, πάλη, παροργισμός, πολυποίκιλος, προελπίζειν, προσκαρτέρησις, ῥυτίς, συμμέτοχος, συμπολίτης, συναρμολογεῖν, συνοικοδομεῖν, σύσσωμος. In the case of two of these, αἰχμαλωτεύειν and εὔνοια, the TR gives each in one other passage (2 Tim. iii. 6; 1 Cor. vii. 3), but on insufficient documentary evidence. The introduction of some of these terms no doubt is due to circumstance. But an analysis of the vocabulary as a whole brings out the fact that in language as well as in thought this Epistle has a character of its own.

4. The Affinities of the Epistle. There are some resemblances which deserve notice between the terms of this Epistle and those of the address recorded in Acts (xx. 17-38) as delivered by Paul to the Ephesian elders at Miletus, *e.g.*, μετὰ πάσης ταπεινοφροσύνης, iv. 2., *cf.* Acts xx. 19; ἐκληρώθημεν, κληρονομία, i. 11, 14, *cf.* Acts xx. 32; the Divine βουλή, i. 11, *cf.* Acts xx. 27; the Divine δύναμις and κράτος, i. 19, *cf.* Acts xx. 32; the being *builded*, συνοικοδομεῖσθε, ii. 21, *cf.* Acts xx. 32. But apart from these we find a number of resemblances between this Epistle and other NT writings which are of interest, and which may point to certain relationships between them. There are a few points of contact, *e.g.*, between this Epistle and the three Pastoral Epistles (*e.g.*, in 2 Tim. i. 9, 10, ii. 1), which have been considered to go some way to establish identity of authorship, or at least of ultimate source. But these do not amount to much. There are other correspondences which are thought to indicate a certain affinity between this Epistle and the Fourth Gospel. Among these are reckoned the prominence given in both to the great conceptions of ἀγάπη and γνῶσις; the designation of Christ as ὁ ἠγαπημένος (Eph. i. 4) as compared with the terms of John iii. 35, x. 17, xv. 9, xvii. 23, 24, 26; the ἐξελέξατο πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου of Eph. i. 4, and the ἠγάπησάς με πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου of John xvii. 24; the common use of the figures of *light* and *darkness* (Eph. v. 11, 13; John iii. 20, 21), and the particular phrases ὡς τέκνα φωτὸς περιπατεῖτε (Eph. v. 8), περιπατεῖτε ὡς τὸ φῶς ἔχετε (John xii. 35); the designation of the work of regeneration as a *quickening of the dead* (Eph. ii. 5, 6; John v. 21, 25, 28). In both writings again we have the work of redemption presented under the aspect of a *sanctification* or *setting apart* (ἁγιάζειν, Eph. v. 26; John xvii. 17, 19); and in both this is given as taking effect by way of a *cleansing* or *purifying by the word*—καθαρίσας . . . ἐν ῥήματι (Eph. v. 26), καθαρὸς διὰ τὸν λόγον (John xv. 3). We have also the idea of *grace according to measure* (ἡ χάρις κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τῆς δωρεᾶς τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Eph. iv. 17), and *grace without measure* in the one

case of Christ (John iii. 31). The striking resemblance between the ἀνέβη . . . κατέβη, ὁ καταβάς . . . ὁ ἀναβάς in Eph. iv. 9, 10, and the declaration οὐδεὶς ἀναβέβηκεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς in John iii. 13 is also noticed. But less can be made of this, as the terms in Ephesians are drawn from an OT quotation. Nor can much be made either of the contention that what is said of Christ as the point of union or restoration for a divided world in Eph. i. 10 is essentially the same as the representation of Him as the Λόγος in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel; or of the parallel in such passages in John as x. 16, xi. 52, xvii. 20, 21 to the terms in which this Epistle enlarges on the inclusion of the Gentiles (ii. 13-22, iii. 6). The more relevant of these coincidences, however, may perhaps be taken to indicate an acquaintance on the part of the writer of the Fourth Gospel with this Epistle. They show at least that the authors of these two writings had much in common both in terms and in ideas.

There are certain points of contact also between *Ephesians* and the *Apocalypse*, of which much has been made by Holtzmann. Minor resemblances are discovered between such passages as Eph. i. 8 and Apoc. xiii. 18; Eph. ii. 13 and Apoc. v. 9; Eph. iii. 9 and Apoc. iv. 11, x. 6; Eph. iii. 18 and Apoc. xi. 1, xxi. 15-17; Eph. v. 32 and Apoc. i. 20. But these are too uncertain and remote to trust to. Of more importance are the coincidences between the view of Christ's relation to the Church in Eph. v. 25, etc., and the figure of the Church as the Bride of the Lamb in Apoc. xix. 7; the mention of the *Apostles and prophets* in Eph. ii. 20 and Apoc. xxi. 14; the μυστήριον *revealed* (ἀπεκαλύφθη) "to His holy Apostles and prophets (Eph. iii. 5) and the μυστήριον Θεοῦ in Apoc. x. 7; the μὴ συγκοινωνεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς ἀκάρποις of Eph. v. 11 and the ἵνα μὴ συγκοινωνήσητε ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις αὐτῆς of Apoc. xviii. 4. It cannot be said, however, that these amount to much. Few would pronounce them sufficient to prove any literary or doctrinal dependence of the one writing on the other. Holtzmann, however, infers from them that the writer of *Ephesians* made some use of the *Apocalypse*.

Another writing with which *Ephesians* is thought to be in affinity is the Epistle to the *Hebrews*. Considerable resemblance is found between the two in their view of the Person of Christ, *e.g.*, in Eph. i. 10, 20-22, iv. 8-10, 15 and Heb. i. 8-13, ii. 9, x. 12, 13, etc. The *seating* of Christ *on the right hand of God* appears in both Epistles (Eph. i. 20; Heb. i. 3, viii. 1, x. 12). So is it also with the use of the term παρρησία with reference to access to God (Eph. iii. 12; Heb. iv. 16); with the conception of Christ's work as *a sanctifying* (ἁγιάζειν, Eph. v. 25, 26; Heb. xiii. 12, x. 10); and with the place

given to *the blood* of Christ (Eph. i. 7; Heb. ix. 12). In the use of terms, too, there are resemblances of some significance. In both we have the phrases αἷμα καὶ σάρξ (for the more usual σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα), ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν, αἰὼν μέλλων, προσφορὰ καὶ θυσία, εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν. And certain expressive words are found in both, such as ἀγρυπνεῖν, κραυγή, ὑπεράνω, βουλή. These things have been supposed to point to the priority of *Ephesians*, while some, on the other hand (*e.g.*, von Soden), have regarded them as indicating that *Hebrews* is the earlier writing. But it would be in the highest degree precarious to draw any inference from such data with respect to the chronological relation of the one Epistle to the other.

Of more interest is the connection between our Epistle and 1 *Peter*. The points of affinity between these two writings have been exaggerated, it is true, and conclusions have been drawn from them with a confidence which they do not warrant. They undoubtedly deserve attention, however, both for their number and for their significance. At the same time the lists prepared by Holtzmann and others require to be carefully sifted and considerably reduced. Among the more relevant coincidences are the following: the place given to *hope;* the connection of the Christian hope with the resurrection of Christ and with the κληρονομία (Eph. i. 18-20; 1 Pet. i. 3-5); the prominence of the idea of the Divine power (δύναμις Θεοῦ, Eph. i. 19; 1 Pet. i. 5); the mention of the *access* or *introduction* (τὴν προσαγωγὴν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, Eph. ii. 18) to God which we have through Christ in the one, and the definition of the object of Christ's sufferings in the other (ἵνα ἡμᾶς προσαγάγῃ τῷ Θεῷ, 1 Pet. iii. 18); the *mystery* hid πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου in Eph. iii. 9, and the *fore-ordination* of Christ πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου in 1 Pet. i. 20. Perhaps of yet greater significance are the parallels in idea and in expression with regard to the *ascension* of Christ (Eph. iv. 8-10; 1 Pet. iii. 22); the *session* of Christ at God's right hand in heaven (ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, Eph. i. 20; ὅς ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ, πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανόν, 1 Pet. iii. 22); the *subjection of all angelic powers* to Christ (Eph. i. 21; 1 Pet. iii. 22).

There are other coincidences to which great importance has been attached, but which are of more doubtful relevancy. The most striking of these are the analogous statements about the *prophets*, the hiding of the meaning of their prophecies from themselves, and the extent of the revelation made to them (1 Pet. i. 10-12; Eph. iii. 5, 10). But it is not the same class of prophets that is in view in both. In 1 Peter it is the OT prophets; in Ephesians it appears to be the NT prophets. The resemblance between Eph. ii. 18-22 and 1 Pet. ii. 4-6 must be discounted to a considerable extent, because

both writers are quoting the familiar passage in Ps. cxviii. 22, or have its terms in mind. Nor does the coincidence between the opening doxologies (1 Pet. i. 3; Eph. i. 3—in both εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) carry us very far. On the other hand there are some marked resemblances in syntax and construction, especially in the paragraphs immediately following these doxologies.

On these *data* very contradictory conclusions have been suspended. Some have inferred that the author of *Ephesians* was a debtor to 1 *Peter* (Hilgenfeld, Weiss). Others have taken the author of 1 *Peter* to be a borrower from *Ephesians*. The theory has also been broached that both Epistles proceed from one hand, possibly that of the writer of Acts and the Third Gospel. Others have explained the case by supposing that Peter may have heard Paul in Rome, or that there may have been converse between the two Apostles in Rome which is reflected in these parallels. So different are the aspects in which these things present themselves to different minds. One thing at least it is very difficult to imagine. That is, that a writer of the genius and power which the Epistle to the Ephesians discloses could have been a borrower even from the author of 1 Peter.

The question of greatest interest, however, is that touching the relation between the Epistle to the *Ephesians* and the Epistle to the *Colossians*. Here the resemblances and the differences are equally striking and unmistakable. The general likeness in the *structure* of the two writings arrests attention at once—in the division of the matter between the doctrinal and the practical, in the form of the paragraphs, and in much of the diction. It is calculated, indeed, that in some seventy-eight out of 155 verses we have much the same phraseology. Lists have been compiled by De Wette and others including the following passages: Eph. i. 4; Col. i. 22: Eph. i. 6, 7; Col. i. 13, 14: Eph. i. 10; Col. i. 20: Eph. i. 15-17; Col. i. 3, 4: Eph. i. 18; Col. i. 27: Eph. i. 21; Col. i. 16: Eph. i. 22 f.; Col. i. 18 f.: Eph. ii. 1, 12; Col. i. 21: Eph. ii. 5; Col. ii. 13: Eph. ii. 15; Col. ii. 14: Eph. ii. 16; Col. ii. 20: Eph. iii. 1; Col. i. 24: Eph. iii. 2; Col. i. 25: Eph. iii. 3; Col. i. 26: Eph. iii. 7; Col. i. 23, 25: Eph. iii. 8 f.; Col. i. 27: Eph. iv. 1; Col. i. 10: Eph. iv. 2; Col. iii. 12 f.: Eph. iv. 3 f.; Col. iii. 14 f.: Eph. iv. 15 f.; Col. ii. 19: Eph. iv. 19; Col. iii. 1, 5: Eph. iv. 22 f.; Col. iii. 8 ff.: Eph. iv. 25 f.; Col. iii. 8 f.: Eph. iv. 29; Col. iii. 8., iv. 6: Eph. iv. 31; Col. iii. 12 f.: Eph. v. 3; Col. iii. 5: Eph. v. 4; Col. iii. 8: Eph. v. 5; Col. iii. 5: Eph. v. 6; Col. iii. 6: Eph. v. 15; Col. iv. 5: Eph. v. 19 f.; Col. iii. 16 f.: Eph. v. 21; Col. iii. 18: Eph. v. 25; Col. iii. 19: Eph. vi. 1; Col. iii. 20: Eph. vi. 4; Col. iii. 21: Eph. vi. 5 ff.; Col.

iii. 22 ff.: Eph. vi. 9; Col. vi. 1: Eph. vi. 18 ff.; Col. iv. 2 ff.: Eph. vi. 21 f.; Col. iv. 7 f.

These parallels are by no means all of the same value. Yet with all necessary deductions they are remarkable both in number and in quality. Taken along with the large resemblance in matter, which extends in some parts over considerable sections, they exhibit a relationship close enough to warrant us to speak of the two as sister Epistles.

It does not follow from this, however, that the one is dependent on the other. There are, indeed, important differences between the two kindred writings which make it difficult to regard the one as made up out of the other. The style is different, that of *Ephesians* being round, full, and rhythmical, where that of *Colossians* is more pointed, logical and concise. The question of the *Church* has no such place in the latter as in the former. The Epistle to the Ephesians has much more of an OT colouring than that to the Colossians. In the latter we have only one OT quotation or allusion. In the former we have eight or nine, *viz.*: Gen. ii. 24 (Eph. v. 31); Exod. xx. 12 (Eph. vi. 2); Ps. iv. 4 (Eph. iv. 26); Ps. viii. 6 (Eph. i. 22); Ps. lxviii. 18 (Eph. iv. 8); Ps. cxviii. 22 (Eph. ii. 20); Song of Songs iv. 7 (Eph. v. 27, perhaps); Isa. lvii. 9 (Eph. ii. 17); Isa. lx. 1 (Eph. v. 14). There are phrases which are distinctive of the Epistle to the Ephesians, but which do not reappear in that to the Colossians, *e.g.*, τὰ ἐπουράνια. And besides all this there are whole paragraphs in *Ephesians* which have nothing like them in *Colossians*—those dealing with the union of Jew and Gentile in the one Church of God as the subject of the Divine predestination (Eph. i. 3-14); the unity of the faith and of the Church (iv. 5-16); the contrast between the light and the darkness with their corresponding results (v. 8-14); the mystery of the marriage-union as a reflection of the union between Christ and the Church (v. 22-33); the description of the panoply of God (vi. 10-17). And in like manner there are whole sections in *Colossians*, such as the polemical passage in chap. ii. and the salutations in chap. v., which have no place in *Ephesians*.

The question raised by the co-existence of these likenesses and differences has been very variously answered. Some have inferred that *Colossians* must have been the original writing, and that *Ephesians* resembles it at so many points because it has been borrowed largely from it. Others have regarded *Ephesians* as the earlier and more original composition. The scholar who has gone most laboriously into the details of this question, *viz.*, H. J. Holtzmann, came to the conclusion that the priority could not be given wholly to

either Epistle, but that there were sections of *Ephesians* (*e.g.*, i. 4, *cf.* Col. i. 22 ; i. 6, 7, *cf.* Col. i. 13, 14 ; iii. 3, 5, 9, *cf.* Col. i. 26, ii. 2) which pointed to the priority of that Epistle, while there were a considerable number that pointed in the opposite direction. He took refuge, therefore, in the complicated theory that *Colossians* as we have it is not the Epistle as it originally was ; that there was a briefer Pauline Epistle to the Colossian Church on which the author of the Epistle to the Ephesians based his work ; that the Colossian Epistle was afterwards enlarged by this author ; and that the hand that did all this was not Paul's own, but perhaps that of the writer who added the closing doxology to the Epistle to the Romans.

This is a far-fetched explanation, and one beset by many difficulties. The terms supposed to have been taken from the Epistle to the Colossians come in quite simply and naturally in the sister Epistle, but by no means in the same context or connection. The most distinctive sections of the Colossian Epistle, those dealing with the strange, speculative views of Christ's person and relations, have no place in the Ephesian Epistle, and it is surely a surprising circumstance that a borrower such as the compiler of *Ephesians* is supposed to be should have so carefully avoided these things and should have appropriated only the least characteristic parts of the writing which he chose for the basis of his own communication. It is still more surprising that a writer capable of producing the Ephesian Epistle should have thought of using another composition in this dependent manner. In point of fact there is nothing in the Epistle to the Ephesians, whether of likeness or of unlikeness, that may not be accounted for in a far simpler and more natural way. A writer addressing himself in two different communications, prepared much about the same time, to Churches in the same part of the world, not widely separated from each other, with much in common, but with something of difference also in their circumstances, their dangers and their needs, naturally falls into a style and a tenor of address which will be to a considerable extent the same in both writings and yet have differences rising naturally out of the different positions.

5. Authorship of the Epistle. The historical evidence in favour of the Pauline authorship of this Epistle is very strong. We have the best reason for saying that by the end of the second century it was generally regarded as the work of Paul. There is evidence also that it was in circulation by the close of the first century or the beginning of the second. The place which it had then, and the use which was made of it, also indicate that it was recognised as more than an ordinary writing—that it was accepted indeed for what

it professed to be. In short, in oldest antiquity there is nothing to show that the claim which it bore upon its face was questioned, or that it was assigned to any other writer than Paul.

It is possible that within the NT writings themselves we have an important indication of the authorship. In Col. iv. 16 mention is made of an Epistle "from Laodicea". If *Colossians* is accepted as what it professes to be, and that Epistle "from Laodicea" can be identified, as many hold it can, with our Epistle to the Ephesians, we have a very direct witness to the Pauline authorship. But apart from that there are things of great interest in relation to the question of authorship in very early Christian literature. Even in Clement of Rome there are forms of expression which look like echoes of ideas and terms characteristic of this Epistle. Thus the phrase ἠνεῴχθησαν ὑμῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ τῆς καρδίας in chap. 36 recalls Eph. i. 18. The statement in Eph. i. 4 of our election of God in Christ (καθὼς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ, etc.) may perhaps be reflected in what is said of Christ Himself and us in chap. 64—ὁ ἐκλεξάμενος τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν καὶ ἡμᾶς δι' αὐτοῦ εἰς λαὸν περιούσιον. The paragraph on unity, too, in Eph. iv. 4-6 may be reflected in chap. 46—ἢ οὐχὶ ἕνα Θεὸν ἔχομεν καὶ ἕνα Χριστόν; καὶ ἓν πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος τὸ ἐκχυθὲν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, καὶ μία κλῆσις ἐν Χριστῷ. The most that can be said, however, of these analogies is that they are suggestive. Still less can be made of the witness of the *Didaché* or of certain passages in the Epistle of Barnabas (vi. 15, xix. 7). In the first of these two writings we have these two statements which have a general, but only a general, resemblance to Eph. vi. 5, 9, *viz.*, ὑμεῖς δὲ οἱ δοῦλοι ὑποταγήσεσθε τοῖς κυρίοις ὑμῶν ὡς τύπῳ Θεοῦ ἐν αἰσχύνῃ καὶ φόβῳ (*Did.*, iv., 11), and οὐκ ἐπιτάξεις δούλῳ σου ἢ παιδίσκῃ τοῖς ἐπὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Θεὸν ἐλπίζουσιν, ἐν πικρίᾳ σου. But this is all.

It is different with the testimony of Ignatius. It is claimed indeed by some excellent scholars that in one interesting passage Ignatius speaks definitely and unmistakably of Paul as the writer of an Epistle to the Ephesians. That is the statement in *Ep. ad Eph.*, c. 12, Παύλου συμμύσται (ἐστε) τοῦ ἡγιασμένου . . . ὃς ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ μνημονεύει ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. The difficulty attaching to the interpretation of the second clause is seen perhaps in certain ancient variations of reading—in the substitution of μνημονεύω in the Armenian Version, and in the amplification ὃς πάντοτε ἐν ταῖς δεήσεσιν αὐτοῦ μνημονεύει ὑμῶν which it receives in the longer form of Ignatius. In order to make it carry the inference drawn from it the rendering "in all the Epistle" or "in every part of the Epistle to you" must be given it. But, not to speak of the inept

meaning that would thus be the result, it is very doubtful whether that rendering can be accepted as grammatically justifiable. None of the few instances which are adduced in support of the contention that πᾶς without the article can mean "the whole" can be said to be free of doubt. Some, *e.g.*, πᾶσα Ἱεροσόλυμα (Matt. ii. 3), πᾶς Ἰσραήλ (Rom. xi. 26), are not pertinent, inasmuch as the nouns are proper names. Others are almost equally doubtful for other reasons, *e.g.*, ἐπὶ παντὸς προσώπου τῆς γῆς (Acts xvii. 26), where the phrase πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς has much the force of a proper name, there being only one such thing. The same in effect is the case with πᾶν σῶμα in a passage of Aristotle which has been very confidently appealed to, *viz.*, δεῖ τὸν πολιτικὸν εἰδέναι πῶς τὰ περὶ ψυχῆς· ὥσπερ καὶ τὸν ὀφθαλμοὺς θεραπεύοντα, καὶ πᾶν σῶμα (*Eth. Nic.*, i., 13, 7). For σῶμα is used there not in the sense of any particular body, but in that of *body* as distinguished from *soul*. If the sentence must be translated in accordance with the stated force of πᾶς in conjunction with an anarthrous noun, *viz.*, as = "in every letter," it cannot safely be concluded that Ignatius had in his mind a particular Epistle of St. Paul's known to be addressed to the Ephesians. It would be strange, indeed, as Professor Abbott remarks (*ut sup.*, p. xi), that if Ignatius wished to remind the Ephesians of Paul's regard for them he should "only refer to the mention of them in other Epistles, and not at all to that which had been specially addressed to them". But allowing this contested passage to stand aside, we find Ignatius elsewhere using words or phrases which appear to indicate an acquaintance with characteristic expressions in our Epistle, such as πλήρωμα, προορίζεσθαι, ἐκλέγειν, θέλημα τοῦ Πατρός, λίθοι ναοῦ πατρός, ἡτοιμασμένοι εἰς οἰκοδομὴν Θεοῦ πατρός (chap. ix.; *cf.* Eph. ii. 20-22), μιμηταὶ ὄντες τοῦ Θεοῦ (chap. i.; *cf.* Eph. v. 1).

The witness of Polycarp, Hermas and Hippolytus is also of some significance. In Polycarp we have two passages which have all the appearance of quotations from our Epistle or reminiscences of its terms, *viz.*: χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι, οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων (*Ep. ad Philipp.*, chap. i.; *cf.* Eph. ii. 5, 8, 9); and (in the Latin form, the Greek not being extant) "ut his scripturis dictum est, *irascimini et nolite peccare* et *sol non occidat super iracundiam vestram*" (chap. xii.; *cf.* Eph. iv. 26). In Hermas, not to mention other sentences which are less definite, we have these—μηδὲ λύπην ἐπάγειν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ σεμνῷ καὶ ἀληθεῖ (*Mand.*; *cf.* Eph. iii. 30); and ἔσονται εἰς ἓν πνεῦμα καὶ ἓν σῶμα (*Sim.*, ix., 13; *cf.* Eph. iv. 4, 5). From Hippolytus we gather that Eph. iii. 4-18 was quoted as γραφή by the Valentinians (*Philos.*, vi., 34).

The judgments of scholars have differed and no doubt will continue to differ as to the relevancy and the value of these testimonies.

But with Irenæus at least and the Muratorian Canon we reach sure and indisputable ground. Irenæus refers to Paul by name as the author of our Epistle and quotes it as his. He cites Eph. v. 13 as words of Paul (*Adv. Hær.*, i., 8, 5); and he expresses himself thus—κάθως ὁ μακάριος Παῦλός φησιν ἐν τῇ πρός Ἐφεσίους ἐπιστολῇ· ὅτι μέλη ἐσμὲν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ (*Adv. Hær.*, v., 2, 3; *cf.* Eph. v. 30). The Muratorian Canon mentions the Ephesians as one of the Churches to which Paul wrote Epistles. The testimony of Clement of Alexandria is like that of Irenæus. Thus, after citing 2 Cor. xi. 2 as an injunction of the Apostle's (ὁ ἀπόστολος ἐπιστέλλων πρὸς Κορινθίους φησίν), he introduces Eph. iv. 13-15 in these terms—σαφέστατα δὲ Ἐφεσίοις γράφων . . . λέγων· μεχρὶ καταντήσωμεν οἱ πάντες εἰς τὴν ἑνότητα τῆς πίστεως, κ.τ.λ. (*Paed.*, i., 18). In the same way he quotes 1 Cor. xi. 3 and Gal. v. 16 ff. as words of Paul (φησὶν ὁ ἀπόστολος), and proceeds thus—διὸ καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους γράφει· ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις ἐν φόβῳ Θεοῦ, etc., as in Eph. v. 21-25 (*Strom.*, iv., 65). The testimony of Marcion is to the same effect, although he gave the Epistle the title "ad Laodicenos" (Tert., *Adv. Marc.*, v., 17); while Tertullian, his opponent, mentions Ephesus among the Churches that had original, apostolic Epistles, and corrects Marcion only on the matter of the destination—Ecclesiae quidem veritate epistolam istam ad Ephesios habemus emissam, non ad Laodicenos (*Adv. Marc.*, v., 17). And from the latter part of the second century the stream of testimony to the fact that the Epistle was recognised as Paul's flows steadily on.

Notwithstanding the strength of the external testimony, however, there have been not a few in modern times, from Schleiermacher and Usteri on to the present day, who have doubted or denied the Pauline authorship. Among these De Wette, Baur and Holtzmann occupy a conspicuous place. It is to be observed, however, that some who have most strenuously questioned the genuineness of the Epistle still admit it to be of very early date—as early as A.D. 75 or 80. De Wette, *e.g.*, allows it to be a product of the Apostolic age, the work indeed of some highly gifted scholar of the Apostle's, and Ewald's position is something similar. Others take up an indeterminate position. The conclusion of Jülicher, *e.g.*, is that the Pauline authorship can neither be certainly accepted nor absolutely denied.

The arguments leading up to the doubt or denial of the genuineness of the Epistle are based upon internal considerations—style, language, peculiar usages, the nature of the ideas, etc. Thus De Wette regards the composition as unlike Paul's way of writing—in its

want of connection and its many parentheses, in much of its phraseology, and in the poverty of its contents. To him it is a composition copious in words but poor in ideas, lacking originality, so dependent indeed on the Epistle to the Colossians as to look like a "verbose amplification" of it, the work not of Paul himself but of an imitator. But the similarities between *Ephesians* and *Colossians*, as we have seen, admit of a simple explanation, and it is a surprising judgment, one that few certainly will accept, which De Wette pronounces on our Epistle when he speaks of it as having no distinctive character, as a dependent production, and non-Pauline in style. We should rather say with Meyer that it is so like Paul in tone, tenor and much else as to make it hard indeed to imagine that it can be the work of a mere imitator; all the more so if it is, as De Wette thinks it, without any special object.

Baur, Schwegler, and other adherents of the Tübingen School dilate chiefly on its doctrinal character as inconsistent with the Pauline authorship. They find it full of Gnostic and Montanist thought and terminology. They lay stress on the use of such terms as πλήρωμα, on the peculiarities of the Christology, etc., and judge it to be the product of the second century, when Gnostic speculations had taken shape and had become familiar. But this view of the Epistle is no longer asserted with the former confidence or in the pronounced form in which it was elaborated by Baur himself. It is acknowledged more generally now that the *phenomena* in the Epistle on which the old Tübingen School fastened may be accounted for by the operation of ideas which were in affinity with those known as Gnostic, but which came short of the developed Gnosticism of the middle of the second century; and further that the passages most insisted on by Baur, when fairly interpreted, are quite consistent with the form of doctrine found in the primary Pauline Epistles.

The objections most generally urged against the Pauline authorship take the following forms. In the first place the *vocabulary* of the Epistle, it is said, presents great difficulty. The ἅπαξ λεγόμενα are thought to be so numerous and of such a kind as to raise a very serious question. But when the list is examined the case is considerably modified. The whole number of words which are found in this Epistle and nowhere else in the NT is forty-two. The number of words found in this Epistle and occasionally elsewhere in the canonical books, but in none of the other writings generally recognised as Pauline by the critics in question, is thirty-nine, according to the reckoning of Holtzmann. But the Epistle to the Colossians and the three Pastoral Epistles are left out of account in this computa-

tion, and at the most the number of these ἅπαξ λεγόμενα is not proportionately greater than in some of the acknowledged Pauline Epistles. In *Galatians*, *e.g.*, there are thirty-three words used only there and nowhere else in the NT; in *Philippians* there are forty-one; in 2 *Corinthians* there are ninety-five; while in *Romans* there are no less than one hundred and in 1 *Corinthians* one hundred and eighty. Further, some of these terms, *e.g.*, those belonging to the description of the panoply of God in chap. vi., are obviously the products of the figure or the occasion. Some, again, are but single occurrences, and in the case of several there are related forms found in others of the Epistles. For example, καταρτίζω, κατάρτισις, ὁσίως, προσκαρτερεῖν appear elsewhere, though καταρτισμός, ὁσιότης, προσκαρτέρησις happen to be used only in *Ephesians*.

In the second place it is objected that there are certain Pauline words which get a new sense in this Epistle. Instances of this are alleged to be found in such terms as μυστήριον, οἰκονομία, περιποίησις. But with respect to the first of these the only passage in which it can be said to have anything like a novel application is v. 32. In the other four occurrences it is used in reality very much as it is used elsewhere by Paul. The term οἰκονομία, again, as it is handled in this Epistle, has the same general sense of *stewardship* as it has in 1 Cor. ix. 17, though with a different application. And if περιποίησις, which has the abstract sense in 1 Thess. v. 9, 2 Thess. ii. 14, has to be understood as concrete here in chap. i. 14, that is a variation which appears in the use of other terms in the Pauline writings and elsewhere.

In the third place it is objected that in this Epistle certain ideas are expressed by terms which differ from those employed by Paul elsewhere for the same purpose. To this class are sometimes reckoned such words and phrases as ἀγαπᾶν τὸν Κύριον, ἀγαπᾶν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, δίδοναί τινα τί, ἀγαθὸς πρός τι, δέσμιος, ἵστε γινώσκοντες, εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων, πρὸ καταβολῆς τοῦ κόσμου, σωτήριον, αἱ διάνοιαι, τὰ θελήματα, πνεῦμα τοῦ νοός. Little need be said of peculiarities of this kind. Some of them have their explanation in the nature of the subject or in simple variety in style and expression. Others have affinities elsewhere in the Pauline writings. How varied, *e.g.*, is Paul's way of speaking of *understanding*, *spirit*, etc. Is a writer like St. Paul to be shut up to the same stereotyped forms of expression in one writing after another? Is he to be debarred from using the word ἀγαπᾶν with reference to Christ or to the Church in this Epistle, merely because in other Epistles he uses it with regard to God? And is it impossible for him to

address his hearers as τέκνα ἀγαπητά when the imitation of God is in view, because elsewhere he may use that designation with regard to their relations to himself?

Some of the instances most commonly cited, however, deserve more attention. There is, *e.g.*, the use of φωτίζειν in iii. 9, in application to the Apostle's commission to enlighten or instruct. This, it is urged, is an application of the word not found elsewhere in the Pauline writings. But that might be the case and yet its use here might have its justification. The reading is not certain. The question is whether πάντας should be inserted or not. If it is omitted, then the aspect of the question is changed. If it is inserted, there are analogies to this use of φωτίζειν in the LXX (Jud. xiii. 8; 2 Kings xii. 2, xvii. 27, 28), and Paul may have followed these. There is again the designation of God as ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (i. 17). This indeed is a rare designation, and for that very reason one most unlikely to have been used by a forger or a mere imitator. But it is a designation perfectly consistent with the highest view of Christ's Person, and one which has its justification in Christ's own words, as recorded in the Fourth Gospel (John xx. 17). The phrase τὰ ἐπουράνια, which is used five times in this Epistle and, as it seems, with the local sense, is confined, it is true, to this one writing among all those attributed to Paul. But the adjective, ἐπουράνιος, in the sense of *heavenly*, is used also in 1 Cor. xv. 40, 48, 49; Phil. ii. 10. It is difficult to see why Paul should not be thought at liberty to use or even to coin such a phrase, or why he might not select the term τὰ πνευματικά instead of τὰ πνεύματα in the large and special sense which it has in this Epistle. Why, too, should it be thought that a word like κοσμοκράτωρ, or a phrase like ὁ ἄρχων τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος, so appropriate to the ideas in hand, must be alien to Paul? So is it also with the word διάβολος which meets us in this Epistle, while in others, it is said, Paul speaks only of Σατανᾶς. But διάβολος is also used in 1 and 2 Tim. The two words indeed are practically the same in sense. They are employed interchangeably by other NT writers, *e.g.*, the authors of the Fourth Gospel and the Book of Acts. Why should a writer of the power and the versatility of Paul be tied down to the use of one of these words in all his writings, later as well as earlier? There remains the phrase of which perhaps most has been made, τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀποστόλοις καὶ προφήταις. This, it is said, smacks of the later period when men's thoughts of the Apostles and the prophets of the NT Church had changed. Its use here has been felt to be such a difficulty by some that they have tried to dispose of it as a gloss or as a case of dislocation in the text. But

there is nothing so very strange in this application of the term ἅγιος if we give the word the broad sense which is its proper sense, and which it has indeed in the very same context in the phrase ἐμοὶ τῷ ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ πάντων ἁγίων (iii. 8).

In the fourth place serious objection is taken to the Pauline authorship on the ground of what is held to be the un-Pauline type of thought which appears again and again in the Epistle. It is said, *e.g.*, that the question of the *inclusion of Jew and Gentile in one Church* is presented in a different light from that in which it is seen in other Pauline Epistles. Only here, it is said, is it put before us as the great object or, at least, a primary object of Christ's work and of the Divine predestination (ii. 13-18, 19-22, iii. 5, etc., iv. 7-16); and what is more, it is introduced simply as a matter of revelation and not as a thing over which there had been sharp controversy. It is certainly a remarkable place that is given in this Epistle to the thought of the unity of the Church and the perfect equality of Jew and Gentile within it. But there is no contradiction between this way of looking at the inclusion of the Gentiles and that which prevails in the other Epistles. The statement is in harmony with the general disposition of the Epistle, which is to carry all things back to the eternal will and purpose of God. The controversy, moreover, was ended, and Paul had no occasion to revive the memory of it in the message needed by those whom he addresses here.

The view, again, which is given of the *Law* in this Epistle is thought to be singular. The Law is not exhibited, it is said, as having any real moral value or religious use, but as having simply a typical significance and as the cause of enmity and separation between Jew and Gentile. And *Circumcision* itself, it is added, is presented as a merely formal thing, and contemptuous words are spoken of it (ἡ λεγομένη περιτομή, ii. 11) which would come strangely from Paul, himself a circumcised Jew and one who elsewhere attaches religious value to circumcision and says good things of it. But where he had for his special subject the oneness of Jew and Gentile as effected by Christ and as seen in the Church, it was matter of course that he should speak particularly of the dividing effect of the Law as it was witnessed in the pre-Christian times. And he does not speak elsewhere of the Law only in one way. He has very different things to say of it according to circumstances; and he presents it in aspects which seem even contradictory, speaking of it, as he does, now as holy (Rom. vii. 9) and again as incompetent (Rom. viii. 3); now as a παιδαγωγὸς εἰς Χριστόν (Gal. iii. 25) and again as carrying a curse (κατάρα) and condemnation with it (Gal.

iii. 10). And the same is true of the ways in which *circumcision* is regarded in the Pauline Epistles: *cf.* Rom. ii. 26-29, iii. 1; Gal. v. 6, vi. 15; Phil. iii. 5; Col. ii. 11, 13, etc.

A very different position, too, is thought to be given to the *Death* of Christ in this Epistle from what it has in the acknowledged Pauline writings. In Epistles like those to the Romans, the Galatians and the Corinthians its *expiatory* and *propitiatory* value is the theme on which Paul dwells with most emphasis. But here this is passed over in silence, and comparatively little is made of the Death of Christ even in other aspects. It is rather His exaltation with all that it involves that is dwelt on. But the difference, so far as it exists, is due to the occasion and to the state of those addressed. It is true that it is as the means by which the reconciliation of Jew and Gentile is effected that the *Cross* is specially mentioned (ii. 16), and it is with reference to the *imitation* of God that Christ's giving of Himself is described as an *offering* and a *sacrifice to God*. But there is nothing in this to make it impossible to suppose that the same author, writing with an eye on other conditions, might speak of the Cross and the Death of Christ in connection with the reconciliation of the world or of the individual. Moreover, we have here the *blood of Christ*, *redemption through His blood*, and the *forgiveness of sins* as related to His blood—all which are distinctly Pauline, if they are also Johannine, terms and ideas (i. 7, ii. 13).

Further, this Epistle is alleged to depart widely from the recognised Pauline Epistles in its *Christology*, its doctrine of Christ's *Headship*, and its view of the *Parousia*. With regard to the first of these particulars this Epistle is more in affinity with that to the Colossians than with any other, in so far as it exhibits Christ in His largest relations to creation, and presents Him as designed in the eternal purpose of God to be the bond of union or reunion for a world existing at present in a condition of dislocation and division. But there are at least the rudiments and foretokens of this doctrine of Christ's cosmical relations elsewhere. There is, *e.g.*, the statement of the "one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things," in 1 Cor. viii. 6; and there is the larger analogy in the great paragraph on the Evangel of Creation in Rom. viii. 19-20. It may be, again, that in other Pauline passages the *body* is said to be as *Christ* (1 Cor. xii. 12) or be *in Christ* (Rom. xii. 4, 5), and the *head* is reckoned simply among the members (1 Cor. xii. 21); whereas here, as in *Colossians*, believers are the *members*, Christ is the *Head*, and the Church is the *body*. But the different applications of these figures have their sufficient explana-

tion in the different subjects. In the present case the subject is the relation between Christ and the Church; in the others it is the relation between the members of the Church themselves. And as regards the *Parousia*, the assertion is that, instead of looking, as Paul does elsewhere, to that great event as the near and certain conclusion of the world's end and the consummation of the Kingdom of God, the writer of this Epistle views the future as made up of a series of ages following one upon the other. But this overlooks the consideration that the αἰῶνες ἐπερχόμενοι may be those that are to make up the Eternity which opens after the Second Coming. The fact remains, however, that the *Parousia* does not occupy the place which it has in such Epistles as those to the Thessalonians, and that there is nothing to show that it fills the writer's vision here as it does there. But this Epistle is separated by years from those earliest writings attributed to Paul. Much had taken place in the interval; the Return of Christ had not been witnessed, but the Kingdom of God had been seen establishing itself far and wide by the preaching of the Gospel. Even in the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians it is recognised that the *Parousia* cannot enter until certain things have happened; and in the further experience of God's ways as regards the times and the seasons, the Second Coming, though the expectation of it was not lost, came to be regarded as a less immediately impending event.

Finally, it is affirmed that this Epistle differs essentially from the acknowledged Pauline writings in its view of the *Church*, and that in more than one respect. It is singular, it is said, in speaking of the Church as *one*, and it gives a view of the Church which could not have emerged till a considerably later date than that to which *Ephesians* must be assigned if it is by Paul. To this it is enough to reply *first* that there is nothing in the Epistle to point to a highly developed condition of the Church. The *organisation* of the Church is not one of the subjects dealt with. The *gifts* bestowed upon the Church are brought into view, and are shown to be of various kinds. But they are not such as infer a comparatively late period. There is no mention of rule by bishops and deacons, nor does the *external* unity of the Church form a feature of this Epistle. The view which is given of the Church as *one* is indeed the highest found in the Pauline writings. But it is not wholly new. It has its foundations at least in earlier Pauline writings, as, *e.g.*, in 1 Cor. xii. 28 (ἔθετο ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρῶτον ἀποστόλους, etc.); xv. 9 (διότι ἐδίωξα τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ); Gal. i. 13 (ἐδίωκον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ); Phil. iii. 6 (διώκων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν); *cf.* in the Book of Acts (the composition of a Pauline

writer), τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ [Κυρίου] ἣν περιεποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, xx. 28. In the sister Epistle, too, the term ἐκκλησία is used both of the local Church and of the universal (i. 18, 24, iv. 15, 16). But, apart from that, the unity is a *spiritual* unity, a oneness which consists in the union of individuals, the ἅγιοι, in faith—not the unity of a corporation or an organisation. There is nothing in this important section of the teaching of the Epistle to make it necessary to suppose that it was written at a time when the multitude of separate local Churches were driven by the needs of defence to form themselves into one large, strong organisation.

In none of these particulars in which this Epistle is asserted to stand apart is there any essential difference between it and the acknowledged Pauline Epistles. There are differences, but they are differences which admit in each case of a natural explanation, and which in no case amount to anything that is incompatible with the recognised Pauline doctrine. On the other hand, as scholars like Jülicher frankly admit, we find in this Epistle many distinctive Pauline ideas, turns of expression, and qualities of style—the use of characteristic terms not found elsewhere in the NT, of particles like διό, ἄρα οὖν, etc.; of ideas like that of the Divine *riches*, etc., as well as the broad lines of Pauline doctrine. Allowing all reasonable weight to the internal considerations, of which so much is made, they come far short of balancing the strong and consistent argument provided by the historical testimony to the Pauline authorship.

6. The Destination of the Epistle. The traditional view is that the Epistle was addressed to the Ephesian Church—to that Church definitely and by itself. This view has still the support of some important authorities. In modern times, however, it has come to be largely held that the Epistle is an Encyclical letter, meant not for the Ephesian Church specifically, but for a number of Churches, or rather for the Christian people found in the Roman Province of Asia, or more particularly in the Phrygian territory. The question is—Which of these two views of the destination of the Epistle best satisfies the data at our disposal, internal and external?

At first the case for the traditional view seems to be far stronger than the other, especially on the side of the historical testimony. Here much depends on how the reading ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in the inscription is regarded. The textual question is not by any means the only element in the case. But it is an important element, and the facts which come into view are of great interest. They are also plain and indisputable. First there is the fact that all manuscripts, both uncial and cursive, with the exception of three, have the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in the

opening verse. There is the second fact that all manuscripts, so far as known to us, without any exception have had this express note of destination in the inscription at one time or other. There is the third fact that the description of the intended readers as the saints *in Ephesus* is found in all the ancient Versions. And in addition to this we have the fact that everywhere the *title* of the Epistle bears that it is addressed to the Ephesians. These things make their impression. They are taken by so high an authority as Meyer to mean that the entire ancient Church (Marcion being discounted), from the Muratorian Canon (somewhere about A.D. 180), Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian, held the Epistle to be addressed to the Ephesians.

The argument from historical testimony in favour of the retention of "in Ephesus" in the inscription is also supported by such considerations as these—that in the Epistles generally acknowledged to be by Paul the readers in view are definitely designated, even when the Apostle is not writing to the Christians of a single Church or city (Gal. i. 2; 1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1); that if ἐν Ἐφέσῳ is omitted, the letter becomes a circular letter "without any limitation whatever of locality or nationality," as Meyer puts it, and that this does not fit in either with the declared mission of Tychicus (vi. 21), or with what is said in such passages as i. 15, ii. 11, iii. 1, iv. 17, etc. It is further urged that in every other case in which Paul makes use of the phrase τοῖς οὖσιν in an inscription, he attaches to it the name of the city or territory to which the readers belong (as in Rom., Cor., Phil.), and that without ἐν Ἐφέσῳ the τοῖς οὖσιν does not admit of a sense that is adequate or even natural. It may be added that some think there is an allusion to the world-famed temple of Diana at Ephesus in chap. ii. It is also strongly argued that it is incredible that no letter should have been addressed by Paul to a Church like this with which he had so many intimate connections, and which was of such importance in the fulfilment of his mission. The case as thus stated seems well-nigh concluded.

But there is another side to it. The arguments last mentioned are obviously of the most precarious kind. There are other Churches with which Paul had very close connections, but which have no letter specifically addressed to them among all the Pauline writings that have come down to us. If there is an allusion to any particular temple in chap. ii. it might be that of Jerusalem rather than that of Ephesus. The phrase τοῖς οὖσιν may be construed satisfactorily, as we shall see (*cf.* Notes on i. 1), even if ἐν Ἐφέσῳ is omitted. The letter may be a circular letter of another kind than that supposed by Meyer to be indicated by the contents. And there may be a

sufficient reason for Paul's departure in this case from his usual habit of designating by their locality the readers he addresses.

But it is of more importance to see how different an aspect the textual question assumes when it is more closely examined. For the weighty fact presents itself that the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ are not found in our two oldest and best manuscripts, ℵB. They have also been struck out of cursive 67 by a second hand which may have some affinity with B. This is a fact of essential importance in view of what these two great uncials have been proved to be in respect of value as well as age. It is reinforced by transcriptional probability, it being far less likely that a local designation so much in Paul's way, if it belonged to the original text, should have been dropped out or deleted by a succession of scribes than that, not forming part of the original inscription, it should have been inserted by later hands. Nor can the witness of the ancient Versions outweigh this textual evidence. For, important as that witness is, it is the witness of documents, the extant manuscripts of which are not equal in antiquity to the Greek uncials.

But the textual case does not end here. It is supported by Patristic testimony of great significance. From Tertullian we learn that Marcion and his followers spoke of the Epistle as addressed to the *Laodicenes*. The relevant passages are these two: (1) Praetereo hic et de alia epistola, quam nos ad Ephesios praescriptam habemus, haeretici vero ad Laodicenos (*Adv. Marc.*, v., 11); and (2) Ecclesiae quidem veritate epistolam istam ad Ephesios habemus emissam, non ad Laodicenos, sed Marcion ei titulum aliquando interpolare gestiit quasi et in isto diligentissimus explorator; nihil autem de titulis interest, cum ad omnes apostolus scripserit, dum ad quosdam (*ib.* 17). In face of this statement it is difficult indeed to suppose that Marcion could have had the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in his text.

Then it appears from what is reported of Origen's commentary that he, too, had not the words in his text. The passage runs thus: Ὠριγένης δέ φησι, ἐπὶ μόνων Ἐφεσίων εὕρομεν κείμενον τὸ "τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσι," καὶ ζητοῦμεν εἰ μὴ παρέλκει προσκείμενον τὸ "τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσι" τί δύναται σημαίνειν· ὅρα οὖν εἰ μὴ ὥσπερ ἐν τῇ Ἐξόδῳ ὄνομά φησιν ἑαυτοῦ ὁ χρηματίζων Μωσεῖ τὸ ὤν, οὕτως οἱ μετέχοντες τοῦ ὄντος, γίνονται ὄντες, καλούμενοι οἱονεὶ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι εἰς τὸ εἶναι, "ἐξελέξατο γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς τὰ μὴ ὄντα" φησὶν ὁ αὐτὸς Παῦλος, "ἵνα τὰ ὄντα καταργήσῃ," etc. (Cramer, *Catena*). Here Origen states distinctly that the phrase was without ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, and that this was peculiar to the case of *Ephesians*; and he proposes a particular way of getting a suitable meaning out of the phrase, giving it a metaphysical sense.

Further, as regards Tertullian, from the passages already quoted, it may be inferred with much probability that he, as well as Marcion, did not have ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in his text. For it is of the *title* that he speaks, and what he charges Marcion with falsifying is not the text itself but the title. If he had had the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in the *text* he would surely have appealed to that in refuting Marcion. But instead of that he appeals to the *veritas ecclesiae*.

Then we have a statement of great importance made by Basil. It is as follows: τοῖς Ἐφεσίοις ἐπιστέλλων, ὡς γνησίως ἡνωμένοις τῷ ὄντι δι' ἐπιγνώσεως ὄντας αὐτοὺς ἰδιαζόντως ὠνόμασεν, εἰπών· τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσι καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ· οὕτω γὰρ καὶ οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν παραδεδώκασι καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς τῶν ἀντιγράφων εὑρήκαμεν (*Adv. Eunom.*, ii., 19). Here Basil is obviously referring to the ἐν Ἐφέσῳ; not, as some painfully endeavour to make out, to the τοῖς or to the οὖσι. In doing so he gives us to understand that the local designation was absent, and his statement is the more important because he speaks not only of the ancient copies themselves, but also of the tradition of the men who were before him, and describes the clause as being in both cases simply τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσι καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

There are other witnesses that are considered to speak to the same effect. But they are less certain and at the best only of subordinate importance. There is a statement by Jerome to the following effect: Quidam curiosius quam necesse est putant ex eo quod Moysi dictum sit "Haec dices filiis Israel: qui est misit me," etiam eos qui Ephesi sunt sancti et fideles essentiae vocabulo nuncupatos. . . . Alii vero simpliciter non ad eos *qui sint,* sed ad eos qui Ephesi sancti et fideles sint, scriptum arbitrantur (On Eph. i. 1; vol. vii., p. 545). In this Jerome seems to refer to Origen and his interpretation of τοῖς οὖσι, and to the peculiar reading. But it is at least *possible*, as Meyer takes it, that the words *eos qui Ephesi sunt sancti et fideles* may represent τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ καὶ πιστοῖς; or it may be, as others, *e.g.*, Alford, think, that Jerome is dealing only with two possible interpretations of τοῖς οὖσιν, without saying anything to imply that the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ were absent from the inscription.

There is, however, something to notice in the case of certain Latin commentators. In some of these the inscription is dealt with in a way that suggests either that they had not the word *Ephesi* in the copies they followed, or that it occupied a different place. Thus Ambrosiater passes over the word *Ephesi* in his comment—non solum fidelibus scribit, sed et sanctis: ut tunc vere fideles sint, si fuerint sancti in Christo Jesu. Victorinus Afer's statement points to a different arrangement of the words—sed haec

cum dicit "Sanctis qui sunt fidelibus Ephesi" quid adjungitur? "In Christo Jesu" (Mai, *Script. Vet. nova Collect.*, iii., p. 87). At a much later period Sedulius Scotus also comments on the passage thus: Sanctis. Non omnibus Ephesiis, sed his qui credunt in Christo. Et fidelibus. Omnes sancti fideles sunt, non omnes fideles sancti, etc. Qui sunt in Christo Jesu. Plures fideles sunt sed non in Christo, etc. (*cf.* Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, pp. 384, 385, and Abbott, *ut supra*, pp. ii, iii). The strength of the case on the side of Textual Criticism, however, lies with ℵB and the testimonies of Marcion, Origen and Basil. It amounts to this, that there is no evidence that the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ formed part of the Greek text of the first three centuries. It is not till we come to the latter half of the fourth century that we have any certain indication of the local designation being included in the inscription, and that indication is found in Basil's implied distinction between the *ancient* copies (τοῖς παλαιοῖς τῶν ἀντιγράφων) and others.

But the question does not terminate there. The *character* of the Epistle itself and the relations between Paul and the Ephesian Church form weighty elements in the case. Everything goes to show how intimate these relations were, how peculiar was the place that this Church had in the Apostle's heart, how much it was his care. Not only was he the founder of the Church of Ephesus, but he spent some three years preaching and teaching in the city. During that long residence his interest in his Ephesian converts was so keen and anxious and his labours in their behalf so great that he describes himself as "ceasing not to warn every one day and night with tears" (Acts xx. 31). Various things that are mentioned or alluded to in his Epistles indicate how constantly he had them in his mind. And the farewell which he took of their elders at Miletus is among the most pathetic passages of the NT. On his side there were words of tender solicitude and loving warning; on theirs thankfulness, affection, an emotion so profound that they "fell on his neck and kissed him, sorrowing most of all for the words which he spake, that they should see his face no more". It is difficult to suppose that Paul could have written a letter intended specifically for this Church without giving some indication of what it was to him personally, without some reference to what he had done for it and the grateful response which his labours had found in it, without letting his feeling towards its members express itself in some form.

Yet this Epistle is in all these respects a singularly neutral composition, without the personal note that makes itself felt in such Epistles as those to Corinth and Philippi, with nothing to say about

any individual but the bearer of the letter, with nothing to connect it with the particular locality, with little or nothing to recall Paul's stay in Ephesus or any of the many things that made his work among the Ephesians so memorable and the terms on which he and they stood to each other so close and affectionate. In the present case there is only the very general salutation which is given in the last two verses; and that is something less particular than the salutation with which the Epistle to the Philippians closes; while there are none of those personal touches throughout the Epistle to relieve the impersonal conclusion such as we find in these other letters. And in addition to the argument which founds on this neutral, impersonal quality of the Epistle, there are expressions here and there which perhaps suggest relations of a different kind from those which we know to have existed between Paul and the Ephesians. Not to speak of such passages as i. 15, there is the statement in iii. 4, which seems to some to mean that those addressed had yet to learn what Paul's "knowledge of the mystery in Christ" was; which could not be said of the Ephesians. There are also the two passages in which Paul uses the formula: "if indeed" (iii. 2, iv. 21, 22); of which it may be said that, although εἴγε does not necessarily express actual doubt, it is a particle more in place where the speaker's own experience or work is not in view, than where he addresses those who owe to him what they are and with whom his relations are direct and intimate.

The result, therefore, to which many have been led since Archbishop Ussher first threw out the suggestion is that this Epistle is a circular letter meant for a number of Churches in a particular part of the Asiatic province, of which Ephesus was one. This view is accepted in one way or other by such authorities as Bengel, Neander, Harless, Olshausen, Reuss, Ellicott, Lightfoot, Hort, Weiss, Woldemar Schmidt, Abbott, etc. This general conclusion, however, is put in more than one form. Some regard the sentence as complete in itself and as requiring nothing to be inserted after the τοῖς οὖσιν. Bengel, *e.g.*, looking to the κατὰ τὴν οὖσαν ἐκκλησίαν of Acts xiii. 1, and the αἱ δὲ οὖσαι ἐξουσίαι of Rom. xiii. 1, rendered it "*sanctis et fidelibus qui sunt* in omnibus iis locis, quo Tychicus cum hac Epistola venit". But the introduction of ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ in the former and the force of the οὖσιν in the latter make these imperfect parallels. Others give the words the sense of "the saints who are really such" or "the saints existing and faithful in Christ Jesus". But neither of these readings can be justified. The only interpretation of the clause that is quite consistent with grammar,

in making it a sentence complete within itself, is "the saints who are also faithful". Adopting this, some (*e.g.*, Abbott, following Reiche, Ewald, etc.) take the Epistle to be addressed not to any particular Church or Churches as such, but generally to all the Christian people in the Phrygian parts. This hypothesis, it is held, explains the absence of local particulars; avoids the necessity of supposing that a blank space had been left after the τοῖς οὖσιν; and enables us to understand the phrase "the epistle from Laodicea" in Col. iv. 16. Others, however, think the case is better met by supposing that a space was left in which the name of the particular church might be inserted to which the letter was addressed in the course of its circular journeyings; or, as Hort prefers to put it, that the blank in the original copy sent with Tychicus was filled in with the name of the Church of each place in which it was read.

The last is perhaps the most natural explanation. And on the whole question it may be said that it is much easier to understand how the local designation should have come to be inserted than to imagine how, if originally in the text, it should have come to be omitted, and that, too, at so early a date. The fact that the Ephesian Church was the Church of the chief city of the Asiatic Province and the most important Church in all these parts would account for the insertion of ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, especially if, as is most probable, it was from Ephesus that copies were sent elsewhere. The fact that the Epistle was meant for a wider audience than that found in Ephesus itself would account for the circulation of such a letter as that referred to as "the epistle from Laodicea". On the other hand, the supposition that the Epistle was meant originally only for Ephesus, and that the ἐν Ἐφέσῳ came to be dropped either by accident or by design, is one hard to entertain. It is difficult to imagine how mere accident could account for the omission, and to say that the local designation was struck out of certain very ancient copies because it did not appear to be in harmony with the contents of the letter is to attribute to these very early times the operation of a criticism of which we have very little evidence.

7. Time and Place of Composition. The date has been put variously, *e.g.*, at A.D. 55-58 (McGiffert); 60 or 61 (Meyer); 62 (Zahn); 61-63 (Lightfoot); 75 to 80 (Ewald); about A.D. 80 (Scholten); about A.D. 100 (Holtzmann, Mangold); 130-140 (Baur, Davidson). The question of the *date* depends largely on the question of the *place*. The Epistle itself makes it clear that Paul was a *prisoner* when he wrote it (iii. 1, iv. 1, vi. 20). It contains things, too, which point to some affinity between it and other Epistles in which the

writer is a prisoner. The reference to Tychicus as the bearer connects it with the Epistles to Philemon and the Colossians (*cf.* vi. 21, Phil. 13, Col. iv. 7), and suggests that these three letters belong very much to the same period, and that they were written when Paul was occupied very much with the same questions. Two imprisonments, however, come into view—the one in Cæsarea (Acts xxiii. 35, xxiv. 27), the other in Rome (Acts xxviii.). Each of these has its supporters.

The view that this Epistle belongs to the period of the Cæsarean Captivity is advocated with great ability by Reuss and Meyer among others. Reuss contends that the theory that the various Epistles of the Captivity were all written from Rome rests mostly on "unauthenticated tradition"; that the mood of the Apostle in the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon suits his circumstances in Cæsarea better than those in Rome; that there are chronological difficulties of a serious nature in the way of referring these three Epistles together with *Philippians* and 2 *Timothy* to Rome; that this makes it necessary to divide the five between Cæsarea and Rome; and that the various allusions to individuals, such as Tychicus, Timothy and Demetrius, in these Epistles are best harmonised, and certain particular statements, such as the πρὸς ὥραν in Phil. 15, best understood, on the theory that those to Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon were written in Cæsarea.

Meyer admits that some of the arguments thus used by Reuss cannot be pressed, especially those founding on such indications as the πρὸς ὥραν, and on the idea that the friends of Paul mentioned in *Colossians* (iv. 9-14) and *Philemon* (10, 23) could not have been with him at Rome. But he attaches great importance to these considerations—*viz.*, (1) that it is more probable that Onesimus should have sought safety in Colossæ than that he should have risked the long journey by sea to Rome, and the possibilities of capture in Rome; (2) that if *Ephesians* and *Colossians* had been sent from Rome, Tychicus and Onesimus would have arrived at Ephesus first and afterwards at Colossæ; in which case it would be reasonable to suppose that Paul would have mentioned Onesimus to the Ephesians, as he does in the Epistle to the Colossians; (3) that the ἵνα εἰδῆτε καὶ ὑμεῖς in Eph. vi. 21 implies that when Tychicus reached Ephesus he "would already have fulfilled the aim here expressed in the case of others," and these others are the Colossians (Col. iv. 8, 9); and (4) that in Phil. 22 Paul asks a lodging to be prepared for his speedy use—a statement implying that his place of imprisonment was not so distant from Colossæ as Rome was.

These arguments, however, when narrowly examined, are not so convincing as they appear at first sight to be. A runaway slave would in reality be more likely to escape discovery in the thick masses of the population of the world's metropolis than in Cæsarea. Our ignorance of the circumstances of the flight of Onesimus and the supposition that the Epistle is an Encyclical make the argument from the lack of any such mention of Onesimus as we find in Colossians uncertain. The ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε καὶ ὑμεῖς does not necessarily imply what Meyer infers from it, and the same may be said of the reference to the lodging in Philemon.

On the other hand there are weighty objections to referring this Epistle to the Cæsarean imprisonment. Thus, the circumstances of the captivity seem to suit Rome better than Cæsarea. For when we compare Acts xxiv. 23 with Acts xxviii. 16, etc., we gather that the Apostle had less liberty in Cæsarea than in Rome, and this accords ill with such passages as Eph. vi. 19, 20. The number of friends mentioned in these Epistles of the Captivity as *companions* of Paul—Aristarchus, Marcus, Jesus Justus, Lucas, Demas, Epaphras, Tychicus, Onesimus—is considerable, so considerable as to make it probable, as Alford, *e.g.*, contends, that he was in Rome; for it was there rather than in Cæsarea that so many might have been with him. Then there is the argument drawn from the relations between the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon, and Philippians. If these letters belong to much the same period in Paul's career (and there is much to favour that), then the mention of "Cæsar's household" in Phil. iv. 22 points much more to Rome than to Cæsarea as the place of the Apostle's residence when he wrote these kindred communications; and the same holds good of the statement of his progress in Phil. i. 21, etc. In neither case can Cæsarea be fairly said to suit the circumstances, or to be of the importance implied. The expectation also which the Apostle appears to entertain when he wrote *Philippians* was that of speedy release and a visit to Macedonia (i. 26, ii. 24, Phil. 22); but what he looked to when he was in Cæsarea was rather that he might go to Rome.

These arguments will become all the stronger if it is made out that *Philippians* was written before *Ephesians*. There is the greater reason then for taking the latter to have been written at Rome. This is a question which need not be discussed at length here. It is enough to say that the arguments against the priority of *Philippians* in the line of these four letters of the Captivity are neither very certain nor very weighty, while there are various internal considerations which favour the priority. Of these the

most important perhaps is found in the points of contact on the one hand between *Philippians* and the earlier Pauline Epistles, especially *Romans*, and on the other hand between *Philippians* and the other three Epistles of the Captivity. These have been worked out with care by Lightfoot among others, at once with regard to particular expressions and to parallels in thought. They have led him and others to the conclusion that the Epistle to the Philippians is the middle link between the great letter to the Romans and those to the Ephesians, the Colossians, and Philemon. The majority of scholars, therefore, take our Epistle to have been written at Rome. If so, its date may be about A.D. 62 or 63.

The question has also been considerably discussed whether our Epistle is prior to that to the Colossians or posterior to it. That it is prior is argued from its more general aim; from the more abstract character of its contents; and from the consideration that, as it is an Epistle which would be much more difficult to draw up than that to the Colossians, the resemblances between the two are best accounted for by supposing that some of the ideas thought out in the former were transferred to the latter. On the other hand, it is held that, as Colossæ was nearer Cæsarea and would be reached by Tychicus before he got to Ephesus, it is more natural to think that the Epistle to that Church would be written before the other, as it would be delivered before it. But this presupposes that the place of composition was Cæsarea. And the same is the case with the contention that the καὶ ὑμεῖς of Eph. vi. 21 refers to the Colossians (*cf.* Col. iv. 7), and presupposes that Paul had already communicated with Colossæ. These are all very precarious arguments, and the question must be regarded as undecided.

8. The Doctrine of the Epistle. The teaching of the Epistle is at once so lofty and so profound as to more than justify all that has been said of the grandeur of the composition by discerning minds in ancient and in modern times. Chrysostom speaks of the Epistle as "overflowing with lofty thoughts and doctrines" — one in which Paul expounds things "which he scarcely anywhere else utters". (ὑψηλῶν σφόδρα γέμει τῶν νοημάτων καὶ ὑπερόγκων· ἃ γὰρ μηδαμοῦ σχέδον ἐφθέγξατο, ταῦτα ἐνταῦθα δηλοῖ.) Theophylact, Grotius, Witsius and others speak of it in similar terms. Adolphe Monod, in his *Explication*, describes it as "embracing in its brevity the whole field of the Christian religion," as expounding "now its doctrines, now its morals with such conciseness and such fulness combined that it would be difficult to name any great doctrine or any essential duty which has not its place marked in it". And Coleridge wrote of it as "one of

the divinest compositions of man," embracing "every doctrine of Christianity—first those doctrines peculiar to Christianity, and then those precepts common to it with natural religion" (*Table Talk*).

What gives it its peculiar majesty is the way in which it carries everything back to God Himself, His will, His eternal purpose and counsel. It is a distinctively *theological* Epistle, in the sense in which the Epistle to the Romans is distinctively *anthropological* or *psychological*, and that to the Colossians *Christological*. The great subjects of predestination and the Divine plan, eternal in the mind of God, centring in Christ and fulfilled in Him, have a larger and more definite place in this Epistle than in any other, excepting Rom. viii.-xi. It has at the same time, however, a rich Christology. Christ is set forth as the Son of God (i. 3, iv. 13); the Beloved of the Father (i. 6); pre-existent (i. 4); raised from the dead and exalted to supreme sovereignty over all things—King of the universe and Head of the Church (i. 20-23, ii. 6, iv. 9, 12, v. 23); the Giver of all spiritual gifts (iv. 7, 8); the Treasury of all knowledge and riches (iii. 8-10); having the place given in the OT to Jehovah (iv. 8).

Its *Soteriology* also is of wide compass. It speaks of Christ as the medium of God's forgiveness of sinners (iv. 32); of redemption as coming to us by Him (i. 7); of the offering and the sacrifice made to God in Christ's giving of Himself (v. 2); of the reconciliation of Jew and Gentile as accomplished by Him; of the gracious results of His work as being effected by His *blood* and His *cross* (i. 7, ii. 16). The doctrine of the *Church* also reaches its highest point in this Epistle. Not only is the Church the Bride of Christ (v. 25-27) and His Body and the fulness of His gifts, but it is the Church ideal—one great, catholic, spiritual body including all the chosen, redeemed and sanctified. And among other doctrines which have a place in it is that of the Holy Spirit as active in the prophets (iii. 5), and as the believer's seal and earnest (i. 13, 14, iv. 30); that of regeneration as the operation of God (ii. 25); and that of the existence and power of evil spirits (ii. 2, vi. 12). The deep foundations of the confessional doctrine of original sin are also found by many in ii. 3, and the great Reformation doctrine of the priority of grace has its roots in ii. 5-8.

9. The Literature of the Epistle. The literature is copious. Not to mention the well-known books on New Testament Introduction, the various works on the Biblical Theology of the New Testament, and the articles in the great Bible Dictionaries and Encyclopædias, there are many treatises of importance in addition to the formal commentaries. Among these may be mentioned C. F. Baur's *Paulus der Apostel Jesu Christi*; H. J. Holtzmann's *Kritik der*

Epheser- und Kolosser-briefe; J. Köstlin's *Der Lehrbegriff des Evang. und der verwandten N. T. Lehrbegriffe;* A. Lünemann's *De Epistola ad Ephesios Authentia;* J. F. Raebiger's *De Christologia Paulina contra Baurium Commentatio;* C. von Weizsäcker's *Apost. Zeitalter;* L. Usteri's *Entwicklung des Paul. Lehrbegriff's;* O. Pfleiderer's *Der Paulinismus* (*Paulinism,* tr. by E. Peters) and his *Urchristentum;* A. Sabatier's *L'Apôtre Paul* (*The Apostle Paul,* tr. by A. M. Hellier); J. T. Wood's *Modern Discoveries on the Site of Ancient Ephesus;* A. C. M'Giffert's *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age;* G. G. Findlay's *Ephesians* (*The Expositor's Bible*); R. S. Candlish's *Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, expounded in a series of Discourses;* J. Pulsford's *Christ and His Seed, central to all things, being a series of Expository Discourses on Ephesians;* R. W. Dale's *The Epistle to the Ephesians, its Doctrine and Ethics;* J. B. Lightfoot's *Biblical Essays;* F. J. A. Hort's *Prolegomena to St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans and the Ephesians;* W. M. Ramsay's *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, Historical Geography of Asia Minor, Church in the Roman Empire,* and *St. Paul the Traveller.*

Among commentaries the following may be noticed: those by Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, Theophylact, Jerome and Œcumenius in ancient times; those by Luther, Bugenhagen, Bucer and Calvin in the Reformation period—of which Calvin's is by far the best; P. Bayne's *Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians* (1643); J. Ferguson's *A Brief Exposition of the Epistles of Paul to the Galatians and Ephesians* (1659); Thomas Goodwin's *Exposition* (1681); L. Ridley's *Commentary* (1546); R. Rollock's *In Ep. Pauli ad Ephesios Commentarius* (1580); also H. Zanchius, *Comment. in Ep. ad Ephesios* (1594); R. Boyd of Trochrig, *In Epistolam Pauli Apost. ad Ephesios Praelectiones* (1652); John Locke, *Paraphrase and Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Galatians, Corinthians, Romans, Ephesians* (1707); J. D. Michaelis, *Paraphrase u. Anmerkungen über die Briefe Pauli an die Galat., Eph., Phil., Col.* (1750, 1769); S. F. N. Morus, *Acroases in Epp. Paulinas ad Galatas et Ephesios* (1795); P. J. Spener, *Erklärung der Episteln an die Epheser und Colosser* (1706); G. T. Zachariæ, *Paraphrastische Erklärung der Briefe Pauli an die Gal., Eph., Philip., u. Thess.* (1771, 1787).

Of works of more recent date those by the following may be mentioned: Dr. Alfred Barry, in Ellicott's *New Testament Commentary for English Readers;* L. F. O. Baumgarten Crusius, *Comm. über die Briefe Pauli an die Eph. u. Kol.* (1847); J. A. Beet, *Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians and Philemon;* J.

T. Beck, *Erklärung des Briefes Pauli an die Epheser;* F. Bleek, *Vorlesungen über die Briefe an die Kol., d. Philemon, u. d. Epheser;* K. Braune, in Lange's *Bibelwerk;* J. G. Candlish, *The Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians;* J. L. Davies, *The Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians and Philemon;* John Eadie, *Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians;* C. J. Ellicott, *Critical and Grammatical Commentary on Ephesians, with a Revised Translation;* G. H. A. Ewald, *Die Sendschreiben des Ap. Paulus übers. u. erklärt,* and *Sieben Sendschreiben des N. B.;* J. F. Flatt, *Vorlesungen über die Briefe an die Gal. u. die Epheser;* G. C. A. Harless, *Comm. über den Brief Pauli an die Epheser;* C. Hodge, *Commentary on Epistle to the Ephesians;* J. C. K. von Hofmann, *Der Brief Pauli an die Epheser;* F. A. Holtzhausen, *Der Brief an die Epheser übers. u. erklärt;* M. Kähler, *Der sogen. Eph. des P. in genauer Wiedergabe seines Gedankenganges;* A. Klöpper, *Der Brief an die Epheser;* J. Macpherson, *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians;* F. K. Meier, *Commentar über d. Brief Pauli an die Epheser;* H. A. W. Meyer, *Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch über den Brief Pauli an die Epheser;* the same, edited by Woldemar Schmidt (1878, 1886), and by Erich Haupt (1897); H. C. G. Moule, "The Epistle to the Ephesians" (*Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*); H. Oltramare, *Comm. sur les Epîtres de S. Paul aux Coloss., aux Ephés. et à Philémon;* L. J. Rückert, *Der Brief Pauli an die Epheser erläutert und vertheidigt;* G. Schneder-mann, in Strack u. Zöckler's *Kurzgef. Kommentar* (1885); H. von Soden, in *Handcommentar zum N. T.;* R. E. Stier, *Die Gemeinde in Christo Jesu: Auslegung des Briefes an die Epheser;* B. Weiss, *Die Paulinischen Briefe im berichtigten Text, mit kurzer Erläuterung;* G. Wohlenberg, *Die Briefe an die Epheser, an die Colosser, an Philemon u. an die Philipper ausgelegt* (Strack u. Zöckler's *Kurzgef. Comm.*, 1895).

Abbreviations.—The abbreviations adopted in this Commentary are either those usually employed or such as explain themselves.

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΦΕΣΙΟΥΣ.

I. 1. ΠΑΥΛΟΣ [a]ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ[1] [b]διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ, τοῖς [c]ἁγίοις τοῖς[2] οὖσιν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ[3] καὶ [d]πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ

a 2 Cor. i. 1; Col. i. 1; 1 Tim. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 1; Titus i. 1; also Rom. i. 1; Gal. i. 1; Phil. i. 1. b 1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; Col. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 1; also Rom. xv. 32; 2 Cor. viii. 5. c Col. i. 2; Phil. i. 1; also Dan. vii. 18; Acts ix. 13, 32, 41; Rom. i. 7; Heb. iii. 1. d Col. i. 1; also Wisd. iii. 9; Acts x. 45; 1 Tim. v. 16; Rev. xvii. 14.

[1] **Ιησου Χριστου,** TR with ℵAFKL, etc., Vulg., Syr.-P, Arm., etc., Gr. and Lat. Fathers. **Χριστου Ιησου,** BDP 17, etc.; Vulg. am., Syr.-H, Boh., Copt., Goth., etc.; Origen, etc.; LTTrWHRV.

[2] **πασιν** is inserted by ℵ[3]A, Vulg., Copt., Cyril Jer., etc. D omits **τοις** before **ουσιν.**

[3] **εν Εφεσῳ** omitted by Bℵ 67[2], Orig., Marc., Basil. It is omitted by WH, and is transferred to margin by TTr and RV.

TITLE.—Ancient documents give the title of this Epistle in various forms. In our oldest manuscripts, BℵAK, etc., it is simply **προς Εφεσιους,** and this is followed by LTTrWH. Later, it becomes **προς Εφεσιους επιστολη,** as in *k*; **επιστολη προς Εφεσιους,** as in *l*; **Παυλου επιστολη προς Εφεσιους,** as in P; **του αγιου αποστολου Παυλου επιστολη προς Εφεσιους,** as in L; **προς Εφεσιους επιστολη του αγιου αποστολου Παυλου,** as in *h*. Nor are these the only forms. In DF we have **αρχεται προς Εφεσιους**; Cod. am. gives *incipit epistula ad Ephesios*, and *f* has **τοις εφεσιοις μυσταις ταυτα διδασκαλος εσθλος.** The form followed by the AV is that of the Elzevir text, **Παυλου του αποστολου η προς εφεσιους επιστολη.**

CHAPTER I.—Vv. 1, 2. *Address and Salutation.*—In the form of his Epistles, especially in the opening address and in the conclusion, Paul follows the methods of letter writing which were customary in the ancient world, in particular in Greece and Rome, in his own time. We now possess a considerable collection of ancient letters, especially communications of a business kind and letters of familiar intercourse. Not a few of these belong to the periods immediately preceding and following the birth of Christ. They help us to a better understanding of some things in Paul's Epistles. They also let us see how he infused the new spirit of Christianity into the old accustomed heathen forms of epistolary correspondence.

This Epistle opens in Paul's usual way, with a greeting in which both the writer and the readers are specifically designated. At the same time the address has certain features of its own, which have their explanation in the circumstances.—**Παῦλος.** In the Epistles which he addresses to Churches, Paul usually associates some one else, or more than one, with himself in the superscription—Sosthenes in 1 Corinthians; Timothy in 2 Corinthians, Philippians and Colossians; Silvanus and Timothy in 1 and 2 Thessalonians; "all the brethren" in Galatians. The only exception is the Epistle to the Romans. In Philemon, too, a letter of a personal and private character, though meant also for the Church in the house of the recipient (ver. 2), he names Timothy with himself. But in the present Epistle no one is conjoined with him in the greeting. It is difficult to suppose that he was absolutely alone at the time when he wrote this letter. The explanation lies probably in the fact that the Epistle was written as a communication of a general character, intended to go round a considerable circle of Churches.—**ἀπόστολος.** Usually this term has the definite, official sense of a

delegate, a messenger with a commission. Occasionally it has a wider and less specific meaning, as in Acts xiv. 4, 14, 1 Cor. ix. 5, 6; Gal. ii. 9, and probably Rom. xvi. 7; 1 Cor. xv. 5, 7; 2 Cor. viii. 23; 1 Thess. ii. 6. In the Gospels, while it occurs oftener in Luke, it is found only once in each of the other three. In the LXX it occurs once, as the representative of שָׁלוּחַ (1 Kings xiv. 6). In later Judaism it denotes one who is sent out on foreign service, *e.g.*, to collect the Temple-tribute. See Light., *Galatians*, pp. 92-101. **Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ.** This order is to be preferred, with the RV and TTrWH, to the **Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ** of the TR and the AV. The genitive may be the ordinary possessive genitive, "an apostle belonging to Christ Jesus"; or it may be the genitive of derivation or source, "an apostle sent by Christ Jesus," the term **ἀπόστολος** retaining something of its original sense of one *sent* by another. The former is the more probable view, looking to the analogy of such phrases as **οὗ εἰμι** (Acts xxvii. 23). The name **Χριστός**, which in the Gospels preserves its technical sense of "the Christ" in all but a few instances (*e.g.*, Matt. i. 1, 18; Mk. i. 1; John xvii. 3), has become a personal name in the Pauline Epistles. The combination "Jesus Christ," or "Christ Jesus," which is rare in the Gospels, occurs frequently in the Book of Acts and most frequently in the Epistles.

There is a variety in the way in which Paul designates himself in his Epistles that is of interest and has its meaning. In some he gives only his name, and makes no reference to his being either an *apostle* or a *servant* of Jesus Christ. So in 1 and 2 Thessalonians. In one (Philemon) he describes himself as a "prisoner of Jesus Christ". In one (Philippians) he is "servant" only; in two (Romans and Titus) he is both "servant" and "apostle". In seven (1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Colossians, 1 and 2 Timothy, and here in Ephesians) it is only the apostleship that is instanced, but in each case with a further statement of how it came to him.—**διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ.** So also in 1 and 2 Corinthians, Colossians and 2 Timothy. In Galatians we have **οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων, οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ Θεοῦ πατρός, κ.τ.λ.**; and in 1 Timothy: **κατ' ἐπιταγὴν Θεοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ** (RV); *cf.* **κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Θεοῦ**, with reference to the commission to preach (Titus i. 3). The phrase used here in Ephesians defines the apostleship as an office which came to Paul neither by his own will nor by the act of any man, but by direct Divine call and appointment. His Epistles certainly reflect his consciousness of this fact. His work, his discourses, his letters all alike reveal the conviction that he was in actuality what he had been declared to be in the message to Ananias—"a vessel of election" (Acts ix. 15). This is the main idea in the defining sentence and its equivalents. They vindicate Paul's authority, indeed, when that is challenged, but they express primarily the fact that it was by grace he was what he was (1 Cor. xv. 10).—**τοῖς ἁγίοις.** Those addressed are designated first by a term which expresses the great Old Testament idea of their *separation*. It does not immediately or distinctively denote their personal piety or sanctity in our sense of the word, though that is dealt with as going with the other. It expresses the larger fact that they are set apart to God and taken into a special relation to Him. In three of the Epistles of the Captivity (Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians) it takes the place which the Church has in the superscriptions of the earlier Epistles (Thessalonians, Corinthians, Galatians). The reason for the variation is not easy to see. It has been supposed to be due to the desire to give "a more personal colouring to the Epistle as if addressed to the members of the Church as individuals rather than as a body" (Abbott). The distinction, indeed, is not carried through the two groups of Epistles; for in Philemon it is again "the Church," not "the saints". —**τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ.** The local definition **ἐν Ἐφέσῳ** (on which see more in the Introduction) is inserted by the vast majority of manuscripts, both uncial and cursive, and Fathers, and, as far as we know, by all the Versions. It is supported also to some extent by the fact that in the oldest manuscripts the title of the Epistle is **προς Εφεσιους**; by the apparently unanimous tradition of the Early Church that this Epistle was addressed to the Ephesians; by the absence of all evidence indicating that the Epistle was claimed in ancient times for any other Church definitely named; and by certain parallels in Ignatius. On the other hand, it is omitted by the two oldest and most important uncials, B and א (in which it has been inserted by later hands); it is expurged from the cursive 67 by a corrector who seems to have had an older document before him; it did not

Ἰησοῦ. 2. [e]χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ e Gal. i. 3 al.
κυρίου[1] Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ.

[1] Χρ. before Ιησ. B.

belong to the text of the manuscripts followed by Origen early in the third century, nor to that of those mentioned by Basil about a century and a half later. The omission is supported also to some extent by a statement made by Tertullian regarding Marcion; and more decidedly by the *general* character of the Epistle (its lack of personal references, salutations to individuals, etc.), as well as by the difficulty of understanding why the phrase should have been dropped if it did belong to the original text. Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort and others, therefore, bracket it in their texts; Tregelles brackets it in his margin and the Revisers give it as an alternative reading in their margin.

If **ἐν Ἐφέσῳ** is retained, all is plain. If the hypothesis is accepted (on which see Introduction) that a blank space was left after the **τοῖς οὖσιν** to be filled in with the names, each in its turn, of the particular Churches in the Province of Asia to which the letter came in its rounds among the congregations, all still remains plain. But if the clause is omitted and if the hypothesis mentioned is not accepted, a difficulty arises in dealing with the combination **τοῖς οὖσιν καὶ πιστοῖς.** There are far-fetched expedients which need only to be named in order to be dismissed—such as Origen's notion that the **τοῖς οὖσιν** has a transcendental sense, meaning that the saints ARE, as God is called I AM, and expressing the idea, as it may be, that they are those who have been called out of non-existence into real existence or an existence worthy of the name; and the somewhat similar idea that the **τοῖς οὖσιν** denotes the reality of their sainthood: "the saints who are really such"; or the reality of their sainthood and faith: "the saints and believers who are truly such". The choice lies between two explanations, *viz.*, (1) "to the saints who are also believers in Christ Jesus," and (2) "to the saints who are also faithful in Christ Jesus". The former gives to **πιστοῖς** the special New Testament sense which it has in such Pauline passages as 2 Cor. vi. 15; Gal. iii. 9; 2 Tim. iv. 3; Titus i. 6. It takes the term to be added in order to complete the description of the readers as *Christians*—not merely *set apart*, as might be the case with Jews (the **τοῖς ἁγίοις** by itself not going necessarily beyond the OT idea and the Israelite relation), but specifically *believers in Christ*. The latter gives the adjective the sense of *trustworthy*, *steadfast*, which is its classical sense, but which it also has in a later passage of this Epistle (vi. 21), in other Pauline Epistles (Col. iv. 9; 1 Tim. i. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 2), and occasionally elsewhere in the NT (*e.g.*, 1 Pet. v. 12; Heb. ii. 17). The term thus defines the readers, who are understood to be Christians, as *faithful*, *constant* in their Christian profession. This is favoured by the designation of the brethren in Col. i. 2, which is the closest parallel and in which the **πιστοῖς** seems to have the sense of *faithful*. It is objected that, if this were the meaning, the **πιστοῖς** should have been followed by the simple dative **Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ**, as in Heb. iii. 2. In like manner it is objected to the former explanation that in connecting the **πιστοῖς** immediately with the **ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ**, "believing in Christ Jesus," it has usage against it, **πιστὸς ἐν** not being found in that sense in the NT although we find **πίστις ἐν** occasionally in Pauline passages (Eph. i. 15; Gal. iii. 26) and **πιστεύειν ἐν** at least once elsewhere (Mk. i. 15). But in point of fact the **ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ** is best taken here in the definite Pauline sense which it has as an independent phrase expressing a distinct and profound idea—that of fellowship or union with Christ, or standing in Him. It is doubtful whether it is meant to qualify both the **ἁγίοις** and the **πιστοῖς** (so Abbott, etc.). More probably it qualifies the nearer adjective, and expresses the fact that it is in virtue of their union with Christ that the readers are **πιστοί.** Their constancy has its meaning and its life in their fellowship with Him. Of the two explanations the second is to be preferred on the whole (with Lightfoot, etc.), although the first has the support of Meyer, Ellicott, etc.

Ver. 2. **χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη**: *Grace to you and peace.* Supply **εἴη**, on the analogy of other optatives, *e.g.*, in 1 Pet. i. 2; 2 Pet. i. 2; Jude 2. This is the Christian rendering of the greeting with which letters began. It combines the Greek form with the Hebrew, but translates the **χαίρειν** of the former into the

f Luke i. 68 al.; Gen. ix. 26; Rom. ix. 5 reff.

3. [f]Εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ[1] τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν[2] Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ [g]εὐλογήσας ἡμᾶς[3] [h]ἐν πάσῃ [i]εὐλογίᾳ [k]πνευματικῇ ἐν

g=Acts iii. 26; Gal. iii. 9; Heb. vi. 14 al. h constr., here only. See James iii. 9. i=Rom. xv. 29; Heb. vi. 7‡; Gen. xxxiii. 11. k=Rom. i. 11; 1 Cor. ix. 11; Col. i. 9; 1 Pet. ii. 5†.

[1] και πατηρ omit B, Hil.[186]; ο θεος και omit Victorin., Hil.[239, 427].
[2] τ. κυρ. και σωτηρος ημων א*. [3] Omit ημας א*.

evangelical χάρις. What Paul desires for his readers is the enjoyment of the free, loving favour of God and the peace which results from it. This is the usual form which the opening salutation takes in the Epistles of the NT. So it is in Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, Philemon, 1 and 2 Peter; as also in Revelation i. 4. It is not, however, the only form. In James, but only in him, we have the old formula χαίρειν (i. 1). In 1 and 2 Timothy and 2 John (but not in Titus according to the best reading) it is χάρις, ἔλεος, εἰρήνη; and in Jude we find ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη.—ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ: *from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.* The *grace* and *peace* desired for the readers by the writer are blessings which come only from God the Father and from Christ. The "Lord Jesus Christ" is named along with "God our Father" as the giver of the grace and peace—a collocation impossible except on the supposition that the writer held Christ to be of the same rank with God or in a unique relation to Him. There is a distinction indicated here between God and Jesus Christ. But it is not in what they are able to give; for the gifts of grace and peace come from both. Nor is any distinction suggested here in respect of *nature.* But there is a distinction in respect of *relation* to believers. To the receivers of grace and peace God is in the relation of *Father;* to the same subjects Christ is in the relation of *Lord.* God is *Father*, having made them His children by adoption. Christ is *Lord*, being constituted Head of the Church and having won the right to their loving obedience and honour; *cf.* MacP., *in loco.*

Vv. 3-8. Doxology, or Ascription of Praise to God for the Blessings of His Love and Grace. This extends over six verses, in one magnificent sentence intricately yet skilfully constructed, throbbing in each clause with the adoring sense of the majesty of that Divine Counsel and the riches of that Divine Grace which had made it possible to write in such terms to Gentiles in a distant province of the heathen Roman Empire. It is Paul's way to begin with a doxology or a burst of thanksgiving. The latter, expressed by εὐχαριστῶ, εὐχαριστοῦμεν, etc., is the more usual, and is found in one form or another in Romans, 1 Corinthians, Philippians, Philemon, Colossians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy (i. 12), 2 Timothy. The former is seen in 2 Corinthians and (in a different form) in Galatians as well as here. The only Epistle that lacks both is that to Titus.

Ver. 3. εὐλογητός: *Blessed.* The LXX equivalent for the Hebrew בָּרוּךְ, Vulg. *Benedictus.* In the NT the idea of being *blessed* is expressed both by εὐλογητός (Luke i. 68; Rom. i. 25, ix. 5; 2 Cor. i. 3, xi. 31; 1 Pet. i. 3), and by εὐλογημένος (Matt. xxi. 9, xxiii. 39; Mark xi. 9; Luke xiii. 35, xix. 38; John xii. 13, etc.). On the analogy of similar verbs εὐλογητός means "to be praised," "worthy of praise," and it is sometimes said to differ from εὐλογημένος in that the latter denotes one on whom blessing *is* pronounced. But that distinction is a fine one and uncertain. Philo puts the difference thus: εὐλογητός, οὐ μόνον εὐλογημένος . . . τὸ μὲν γὰρ τῷ πεφυκέναι, τὸ δὲ τῷ νομίζεσθαι λέγεται μόνον . . . τῷ πεφυκέναι εὐλογίας ἄξιον . . . ὅπερ εὐλογητὸν ἐν τοῖς χρησμοῖς ᾄδεται (*De Migr. Abr.*, § 19, i., 453, Mang.; *cf.* Thayer-Grimm, *sub voc.*). The distinction is shortly expressed thus by Light., "while εὐλογημένος points to an isolated act or acts, εὐλογητός describes the intrinsic character" (*Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul*, p. 310). In the NT εὐλογητός is used only of God; in one case, indeed, absolutely, "The Blessed" (Mark xiv. 61). In the LXX it is used both of *God* (Gen. ix. 26, xiv. 20; 1 Sam. xxv. 32; Ps. lxxii. 17, 18, 19, etc.), and (less frequently) of *man* (Gen. xii. 2, xxiv. 31, xxvi. 29; Deut. vii. 14; Jud. xvii. 2; 1 Sam. xv. 13, xxv. 33; Ruth ii. 20). In the LXX εὐλογημένος is occasionally used of God. In the NT it is used only of man (Matt. xxv. 34; Luke i. 28, 42), of the Messiah (Matt. xxi. 9, xxiii. 39;

Mark xi. 9; Luke xiii. 35, xix. 38; John xii. 13), or of the Messianic Kingdom (Mark xi. 10). In doxologies we are usually left to supply the verb, which may be **ἔστιν** (Abbott); **ἔστω** on the analogy of **ἔστω . . . ηὐλογημένος** in 2 Chron. ix. 8; or **εἴη** on the analogy of Job i. 21, Psalm cxiii. 2, in which passages, however, the form is **εὐλογημένος**. Here, as generally where **εὐλογητός** is the word used and not **εὐλογημένος**, the sentence is best taken as an affirmation, **ἐστίν** being supplied; *cf.* Psalm cxix. 12 in contrast with Psalm cxii. 2; Job i. 21; 2 Chron. ix. 8. In most cases the **εὐλογητός** stands first in its sentence. There are exceptions, where the verb or participle has a position within the sentence or at its close. These are explained by some (W. Schmidt, etc.) as due to the fact that the emphasis is meant to be on the *Subject* of the doxology, not on the idea of the praise itself; by others (Haupt, etc.) more simply as regards most occurrences, if not all, as due to the fact that the copula (**εἶναι, γιγνέσθαι**) is expressed. The cases most in point are 1 Kings x. 9; 2 Chron. ix. 8; Job i. 21; Psalm lxviii. 19, cxiii. 2. In all these instances except the last the form is **εὐλογημένος** and the **γένοιτο** or **εἴη** is expressed. In Psalm lxviii. 19 alone we have **Κύριος ὁ θεὸς εὐλογητός**, and that followed immediately by **εὐλογητὸς Κύριος ἡμέραν καθ' ἡμέραν.—ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ**: *the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.* The same designation of God occurs also in Rom. xv. 6; 2 Cor. i. 3, ii. 31; 1 Pet. i. 3. In Col. i. 3, the **καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ** of the TR is too slenderly supported to be retained. Many good commentators (Mey., Ell., Haupt, Schmied., etc.) take the **Θεός** and the **πατήρ** apart here, placing the genitive in relation only to the latter and making the sense "Blessed be God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," or "Blessed be God who is also the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ". Others (including Theod., Jer., Theophyl., Stier, Blk., V. Hofm., V. Soden, Oltr., Klöp., Beck., Alf., Light., W. Schmidt, Abbott) understand God to be praised here as the God of our Lord Jesus Christ as well as His Father. Grammar leaves the question open; for the inclusion of **Θεός** and **πατήρ** under one initial article does not establish the second view, nor does the use of **καί** instead of **τε καί** disprove it (*cf.* iv. 6; 1 Pet. ii. 25). The first rendering is advocated on account of the extreme rarity of the designation "the God of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Ell.); on the ground that **Θεὸς καὶ πατήρ** being a "stated Christian designation of God," only the **πατήρ** requires any further definition by a genitive (Mey.); or for the reason that the passages in which the phrase **θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἡμῶν** occurs show it to have been Paul's habit to use **θεός** absolutely, the appositional **πατὴρ κ.τ.λ.** serving to define more particularly the *Christian* idea of God (Haupt). The second rendering is to be preferred, however, as the more natural, and is supported by the analogous Pauline construction **ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἡμῶν** (Gal. i. 4; 1 Thess. i. 3, iii. 11, 13). Nor is there anything strange or un-Pauline in God being called "the God of our Lord Jesus Christ". As true Man Christ had God for His God as we have Him for our God. He Himself spoke of God as "My God" in the cry of desolation from the Cross and again in His word to Mary after His Resurrection (John xx. 17). In this same Epistle, too, we have the express designation **ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ** (i. 17).

This form of doxology (as well as the prayer in the greeting for *grace and peace*) occurs again in 2 Cor. i. 3 (as also in 1 Pet. i. 3), but with a different reference—there with regard to Paul's own experiences, here with regard to the Christian enlargement of others.—**ὁ εὐλογήσας ἡμᾶς**: *who blessed us.* To suppose that the **ἡμᾶς** refers to Paul himself is inconsistent with the whole tenor of the paragraph and with the **κἀγώ** in ver. 15. If Paul speaks of God as **εὐλογητός** it is because of the great and generous things He had actually done for himself and for these Ephesians. These things he proceeds to set forth in respect both of their *nature* and their *measure.* He says first that "God blessed us" (not "hath blessed us"). The question is how far he is looking back here. Is it to the time when God first made him and those addressed His own by grace? Or is it to the eternal counsel of that grace? There is much to be said in favour of the second of these two references. It appears to be more naturally suggested by the text than the other. We may, perhaps, plead on its behalf the analogy of the aorists in Rom. viii. 29, 30. It gives unity to the whole statement, and makes the interpretation of the following clauses, each introduced by **ἐν**, easier. Yet on the whole the first is to be preferred, especially in view of the further definition introduced by the **καθώς** of

ver. 4. The idea, therefore, is that in calling us to Christian faith God blessed us, and that the great deed of blessing which thus took effect in time had its foundation in an eternal election. All that Christians are is thus referred back to God's free, decisive act of **εὐλογεῖν**; "blessing" in His case meaning not words of good but deeds of grace. So, too, the **εὐλογητός** which comes from our lips answers to, and is the return for, the **εὐλογήσας** of God. In word and thought we bless God because in deed and positive effect He blessed us; *cf.* Is. lxv. 16.—**ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ**: *with every spiritual blessing.* This defines the nature of the "blessing" with which God so signally blessed us. The **ἐν** might be understood in the *local* sense, as denoting the sphere within which the **εὐλογεῖν** proceeded. But in view of the following **ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις**, it is simplest to take it as the *instrumental* **ἐν**, "by means of"; *cf.* 1 Thess. iv. 18; James iii. 9; and the analogous **ἐν μέτρῳ μετρεῖν, ἐν ἅλατι ἁλίζειν** (Matt. vii. 2, v. 13; Mk. iv. 24, ix. 49), etc. See Winer-Moult., *Grammar*, p. 485; Buttmann-Thayer, *Grammar*, p. 329. The **πνευματικῇ** is taken by some to mean *inward* as opposed to *outward* blessing, or blessing relating to the spirit of man, not to the body (Erasmus, etc.) —a sense too restricted to fit the usage of the term in the NT. Others understand it to mean "of the Holy Spirit," *i.e.*, blessing proceeding from the Holy Spirit. So Mey., Alf. (who makes it "blessing of the Spirit"), etc.; so, too, Ell., who would refer the term *directly* to the Holy Spirit, on the basis of Joel iii. 1 ff.; Acts ii. 16. But this would be more naturally expressed by **ἀπὸ** or **ἐκ τοῦ Πνεύματος**, and it is the *kind* of blessing rather than its *source* that is in view here. It is best, therefore, to take **πνευματικῇ** to define the blessings in question as *spiritual* in the sense that they are the blessings of grace, blessings of a Divine order, belonging to the sphere of immediate relations between God and man (*cf.* Rom. i. 11, xiv. 1, xv. 27; 1 Cor. ix. 11). It is true that these come from God through the Spirit. But the point in view is what they are, not how they reach us. There is little to suggest either that a contrast is drawn between the blessings of the Gospel and the more temporal blessings of the OT economy, as Chrys., Grotius, etc., suppose. There is still less to suggest that the statement is to be limited to the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, healing, tongues, etc., dealt with in 1 Cor. xii., etc. This latter supposition is refuted by the inclusive **πάσῃ**. The expression is a large one, covering all the good that comes to us by grace—whether the assurance of immortality, the promise of the resurrection, the inheritance of the kingdom of heaven, the privilege of adoption, etc., as Theodoret puts it; or all that belongs to the fruit of the Spirit, the graces of love, joy, etc. (Gal. v. 22, 23), as Abbott explains it; or the peculiar blessings of peace of conscience, assurance of God's love, joy in God, the hope of glory, etc., as it is understood by others. The blessing with which God blessed us is the highest order of blessing, not of material kind or changeful nature, but of heavenly quality and enduring satisfaction, and such blessing He bestowed upon us in its every form and manifestation. — **ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις**: *in the heavenly places.* Further definition of the *blessing* in respect of its *sphere* —"in the heavenlies". In the NT the adjective **ἐπουράνιος** occurs both in the literal sense and in the metaphorical, and in a variety of applications—*existing in heaven* (**ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐπ.**, Matt. xviii. 35, v. l. **οὐράνιος**); of heavenly *order or descent* (the Second Adam, **ὁ ἐπουράνιος**, 1 Cor. xv. 48); *originating* in heaven, *belonging* to heaven, *heavenly* in contrast with *earthly* (**κλῆσις ἐπ.**, Heb. iii. 1; **δωρέα ἐπ.**, Heb. vi. 4; **πατρίς ἐπ.**, Heb. xi. 16; **Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐπ.**, Heb. xii. 22; **βασιλεία ἐπ.**, 2 Tim. iv. 18). It is not easy to determine the precise shade of meaning in each case. The plural **τὰ ἐπουράνια** is used of the eternal decrees or purposes of grace as contrasted with the operations of grace accomplished and experienced on earth (John iii. 12); of the celestial bodies, sun, moon and stars (1 Cor. xv. 40); of things or beings in heaven as contrasted with those on earth or under earth (Phil. ii. 10); of the heavenly types and realities of religious services of which earthly ordinances and ministries are the shadow (Heb. viii. 5). The particular phrase **ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις**, however, has this peculiarity, that it occurs five times in this Epistle and nowhere else in the NT. It is a singular fact that even in the writings bearing Paul's name it is confined to this one letter, and is not found even in the companion Epistle to the Colossians which belongs to the same time, has so much in common, and in point of fact presents more than one opportunity, as Meyer observes, for the introduction of such a phrase (i. 5, 16, 20).

In three out of the five occurrences the term has the *local* sense (i. 20, ii. 6, iii. 10), and in a fourth (vi. 12) that sense is also possible, though not certain. The expression in all probability has the same application in the present instance. To take it, with Chrys., Thdt., Beng., and more recently Beck, as a further description of the blessing in respect of its *nature* as *spiritual* or *heavenly* has not only usage against it, but also the consideration that the second of the two descriptive clauses would then add little or nothing to what is expressed by the first. Deciding for the local sense, however, we have still to ask how the phrase is to be connected and what is its particular point. Some connect it (*e.g.*, Beza) immediately with **ὁ Θεός,** making the sense "God who is in heaven blessed us". But this puts the qualifying clause at an awkward distance from its subject. The clause may be connected with the **εὐλογήσας** as describing the deed of blessing in respect of its sphere; which would be most suitable to the case if the **εὐλογήσας** were understood of the Divine *decree* of grace. Some, adopting the same connection, make it refer ideally or proleptically to the blessings laid up for our future enjoyment in the heavenly life (*e.g.*, Th. Aquin.); but the context has in view blessings which are ours in reality now. Others take it to refer to the *Church* as the Kingdom of God on earth, the present depository of the Divine blessings (Stier); but the Church is not identified in this way with the Kingdom of God in the Pauline writings. It is best, therefore, to connect **ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις** immediately with the previous **ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ,** and to understand it as describing the region in which this "spiritual blessing" is found. Not a few interpreters, indeed, pointing to the analogy of ii. 6, Phil. iii. 20 (where, however, it is our *citizenship* that is said to be in heaven, not we ourselves), etc., introduce a mystical sense here, and take "the heavenlies" to be, not "literal locality but . . . the heavenly region in which our citizenship is" (Abbott), the heaven that is created within us here and now by grace. "The heaven of which the Apostle here speaks," says Lightfoot, "is not *some remote locality*, some *future abode;* it is the heaven which lies within and about the true Christian." So substantially also Alf., Ell. (the latter connecting it, however, with **εὐλογήσας**), Cand., etc. But what the writer has specially in view here is the eternal counsel of God and the effect given to it on earth, and there is nothing to suggest that at this point he is thinking of believers as being themselves in a certain sense in heaven even now. It is best, therefore, to retain the simple local meaning (as the Syriac and Ethiopic Versions render it, "in heaven," "in the heavens"), and take it to describe the blessings which are stated to be in their nature spiritual further as being found in heaven. To that they belong, and from thence it is that they come to us to be our present possession on earth. (So Subst., Mey., Haupt, etc.) The choice of the unusual form here may be due to the largeness of the idea. It is not merely that the blessings with which God blessed us are blessings having their origin in heaven (which might have been expressed by **ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ** or some similar phrase), but that they are blessings which have their *seat* where God Himself is and where Christ reigns. —**ἐν Χριστῷ**: *in Christ.* Not merely "*through* Christ". The phrase expresses the supreme idea that pervades the Epistle. Here it qualifies the whole statement of the *blessing*, in its bestowal, its nature, and its seat. The Divine **εὐλογεῖν** has its ground and reason in Christ, so that apart from Him it could have no relation to us. It is ours by reason of our being in Him as our Representative and Head; "by virtue of our incorporation in, our union with, Christ" (Light.). "In Him lay the cause that God blessed us with every spiritual blessing, since His act of redemption is the *causa meritoria* of this Divine bestowal of blessing" (Mey.).

Ver. 4. **καθώς**: *even as.* Not "because," but "according as," "in conformity with the fact that". *Cf.* **καθότι,** which is used in the NT only by Luke and means both "according as" and "because"; and the Attic **καθά, καθό,** for which, indeed, **καθώς** is occasionally used in classical Greek, at least from Aristotle's time. Here **καθώς** designates the ground of the "blessing" and so is also the note of its grandeur. The "blessing" proceeded on a Divine election, and took effect in accordance with that. It has its foundation, therefore, in eternity, and is neither an incidental thing nor an afterthought of God. So in 1 Pet. i. 2, the **ἐκλογή** has its ground and norm in the **πρόγνωσις,** the foreknowledge of God the Father, and that "foreknowledge" is not a theoretical but an efficient knowledge.—**ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς**: *He chose us* (not "hath chosen us"), or *elected us.* The verb, which occurs in the NT

l=ver. 20; τοῖς [l]ἐπουρανίοις [n]ἐν[l] χριστῷ,[2] 4. καθὼς [m]ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς [n]ἐν ch. ii. 6, iii. 10, vi. 12 only; αὐτῷ[3] [o]πρὸ[4] [o]καταβολῆς κόσμου, [p]εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ [q]ἀμώμους

Matt. xviii. 35; Dan. iv. 23. m=Mark xiii. 20; John vi. 70 reff. (1 Cor. i. 27; James ii. 5 only in Epp.); Deut. vii. 7. n=Col. i. 16; see Acts xv. 7. o John xvii. 24; 1 Pet. i. 20 only. ἀπό, Matt. xiii. 35 al. p constr., Col. i. 10, 22. q ch. v. 27; Col. i. 22 only in Paul; Heb. ix. 24; 2 Kings xxii. 24.

[1] Omit εν some cursives, *e.g.*, 7.

[2] After Χριστω insert Ιησου D^{2}, [3]EK 4, 46, 47, 76, 109, 115, Syr.-P., Eth., Theophyl., Victorin., Sedul.

[3] For εν αυτω, εαυτω FG, Did., Athan. [4] προς FG.

only in the Middle (except, perhaps, in Luke ix. 35), is the LXX equivalent for בָּחַר, and expresses the idea of *selecting for oneself out of a number*. It is sometimes alleged that we are not entitled to give it so definite a meaning in doctrinal paragraphs like the present, because there are passages in which it appears to express nothing more than the general idea of a *choice*, without reference either to any special relation to the person choosing or to the leaving of others unchosen. (So, *e.g.*, Abbott.) But the passages adduced in support of this are few in number and by no means bear out the contention. In Luke ix. 35, *e.g.*, where ἐκλελεγμένος is said of the Son, the idea of a choice from among others is certainly not an alien idea (*cf.* Thayer-Grim., *Lex.*, *sub voc.*); and in Acts iv. 5, xv. 22, 25, the point is a choice for oneself in the form of an appointment to a particular service or office. That the verb denotes the choice of one or more out of others is implied in its compound form, and is made abundantly clear by actual usage, *e.g.*, in the case of the selection of the Twelve (John vi. 70, xiii. 18, xv. 16), the appointment of a successor to Judas (Acts i. 24, etc.). In not a few passages it is made more certain still by the addition of explanatory terms, *e.g.*, ἀπό τινων (Luke vi. 13), ἐκ κόσμου (John xv. 19), ἔκ τινων (Acts i. 24), ἐν ἡμῖν (Acts xv. 7). That it means to choose out *for oneself* appears from such passages as Luke x. 42, xiv. 7. The verb ἐκλέγεσθαι is specially used of God's election of some out of mankind generally to be His own in a peculiar sense, the objects of His grace, destined for special privilege, special relations, special service; *cf.* Acts xiii. 17 (of Israel); Mark xiii. 20; John xv. 19; Rom. ix. 11, xi. 5, 7, 28; 1 Cor. i. 27 ff.; Jas. ii. 5; 1 Pet. ii. 9 ff. The foundation of the statement is the great OT idea of Israel as a nation chosen by the Lord to be "a peculiar people unto Himself, above all peoples that are upon the face of the earth" (Deut. xiv. 2; *cf.* Ps. xxxiii. 11, 12, cxxxv. 4; Isa. xli. 8, 9, xlii. 1). What is meant, therefore, is that the blessing which God bestowed on these Ephesians was not a thing of the time merely, but the issue of an election prior to their call or conversion, a blessing that came to them in accordance with a definite choice of them out of the mass of others by God for Himself.—ἐν αὐτῷ: *in Him;* that is, in Christ, not "through Him" simply. But in what sense? It is true that Christ is the first "Elect" of God, and that our election is contained in His. But His election is not the matter in hand here, and the point, therefore, is not that in electing Christ God also elected us (Calv., Beng., etc.). Nor, again, is it that we are *included* in Him (Hofm.), for neither is this the point in view here. The immediate subject is not what *we* are or are made, but what *God* does—His election and how it proceeds. And the idea is that that election has its ground in Christ, in the sense that apart from Christ and without respect to His special relation to us, and His foreseen work, there would be no election of us. An extraordinary sense is attached to the ἐν αὐτῷ by Beys., who takes the point to be that the "divinely conceived prototypes of perfected believers are from eternity posited by God in the One Prototype of humanity acceptable unto Him" (*Christ. d. N. T.*, p. 141). This is a philosophical notion wholly alien to Paul, on which see Meyer, *in loc.* The ἐν αὐτῷ might mean that God's election of us was *in Christ* in so far as Christ was contemplated as having the relation of "head and representative of spiritual, as Adam was the representative of natural, humanity" (Ols., Ell.). But it is best taken as expressing again the broad idea that "in Christ lay for God the *causa meritoria* of our election" (Mey.).—πρὸ καταβολῆς τοῦ κόσμου: *before the foundation of the world.* This is the only occurrence of this particular expression in the Pauline

writings, but it occurs also once in John (xvii. 24) and once in Peter (1 Pet. i. 20). It is akin to the form **ἀπὸ καταβολῆς** (Matt. xiii. 35, omitting **κόσμου** with LTTrWHR *marg.*), **ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου** (Luke xi. 50; Heb. iv. 3; Rev. xiii. 8); as also to these phrases: **ἀπ' ἀρχῆς** (1 Thess. ii. 13), **πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων** (1 Cor. ii. 7), **πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων** (2 Tim. i. 9). It expresses most definitely the fact that the *election* in question is not the setting apart of certain persons at a definite period, an act in time, a *historical* selection, as some (*e.g.*, Beys.) strive to prove, but an eternal choice, a determination of the Divine Mind before all time. The idea of the Divine election in the NT is not a philosophical idea expressing the ultimate explanation of the system of things or giving the *rationale* of the story of the human race as such, but a religious idea, a note of grace, expressing the fact that salvation is originally and wholly of God. In Pauline teaching the subjects of this Divine election are neither the Church as such (Ritschl), nor mankind as such (Beck), but Christian men and women, designated as **ἡμεῖς, ὑμεῖς.** It is, as is here clearly intimated, an eternal determination of the Divine Will, and it has its ground in the freedom of God, not in anything foreseen in its subjects. Of a prevision of faith as the basis or motive of the election there is no indication here. On the contrary, the character or distinguishing inward quality of the subjects of the election is presented in the next clause as the *object* of the election, the end it had in view. (See especially Haupt, *in loc.*)—**εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους**: *that we should be holy and without blemish.* The election, therefore, had a definite purpose before it—the *making* of its subjects **ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους.** The simple infinitive is freely used to express the idea of *purpose* or *design* not only in the NT but in classical Greek (Soph., *Oed. Col.*, 12; Thuc., i., 50, iv., 8; Herod., vii., 208, etc.; *cf.* Winer-Moult., *Gram.*, p. 399). On the **ἁγίους** see under ver. 1. There is a question, however, as to the precise sense of **ἀμώμους.** The adjective means both "without blame" (*inculpatus*) and "without blemish" (*immaculatus*). In the LXX it is a sacrificial term, applied in the latter sense to victims (Exod. xxix. 1; Lev. i. 3, 10, iii. 1, 6, 9, 10, xxii. 19, etc.). It has this sense of "without blemish" also in Heb. ix. 14; 1 Pet. i. 19; *cf.* the use of the noun in 2 Pet. ii. 13. In the Pauline writings it is found, in addition to the present passage, in Eph. v. 27; Phil. ii. 15 (according to the best reading); Col. i. 22. In the first and third of these occurrences it is rendered by the RV "without blemish," in the second, "blameless". On the ground of usage, especially in the LXX, many commentators conclude for the second sense. Light., *e.g.*, takes the point of the two adjectives to be that the former denotes the *consecration* of the victim and the latter its *fitness* for the consecration (*Notes on Epistles of Paul*, p. 313). The Vulg. gives *immaculati*, and Wycl. "without *wene*". On the other hand, there is nothing in the verse to suggest the idea of *sacrifice* or a *victim.* The parallel passage, also, in Col. i. 22, where we have not only **ἁγίους** and **ἀμώμους** but a third adjective **ἀνεγκλήτους,** is on the whole on the side of "blameless". That, too, is the meaning of the word in classical Greek (*e.g.*, Herod. ii., 177), and in inscriptions (C. I., 1974). Little indeed depends on the decision between the two senses; for both terms, "without blemish" and "without blame," may have *ethical* applications. There is the further question, however, whether in this statement Paul has in view the *standing* of believers or their *character*—whether he thinks of them as justified or as designed to be sanctified. The arguments in support of the objective relation to God being a view here (Mey., Haupt, etc.) are weighty. It is held, *e.g.*, that **γίγνεσθαι** would be more appropriate than **εἶναι** if the personal sanctification of believers was in the writer's mind; that in that case the **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** would more naturally have come in *before* the **κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ**; above all, that the tenor of the section as a whole is on the side of the first view, the idea all through the paragraph (vv. 3-14) being what God does for us, not what we are now or are meant to be inwardly to Him, and the objective facts of the forgiveness of sin, adoption, etc., being clearly introduced in vv. 7 ff. On the other hand the ethical sense is strongly advocated by many (Chrys., Theophy., Alf., Ell., Candl., Abb., etc.) on the broad ground that it is so much Paul's way to point us to newness and holiness of life as the great end of the Divine purpose and the Divine call (Phil. ii. 15; 1 Thess. iv. 7; 2 Thess. ii. 13; Titus ii. 14). This is supported further by the presence of the qualifying **ἐν ἀγάπῃ,** if it is attached to ver. 4; and by the weighty consideration that the **ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους καὶ ἀνεγκλήτους** in the

r 2 Cor. ii. 17, xii. 19; Col. i. 22; Jude 24; Levit. iv. 17 vat. s ver. 11 reff. t Rom. viii. 15, 23, ix. 4; Gal. iv. 5 only †. u = Col. i. 20. v Matt. xi. 26 ‖; Luke ii. 14; Phil. i. 15, ii. 13; 2 Thess. i. 11; Ps. v. 12.

κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν[1] **ἀγάπῃ, 5.** [s]**προορίσας**[2] **ἡμᾶς εἰς** [t]**υἱοθεσίαν διὰ** [3]**Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ** [3] [u]**εἰς αὐτὸν, κατὰ τὴν** [v]**εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος**

[1] **εν αγαπ.** is joined with the foregoing by LP, f, Vlg.; with the following by d, g, Orig., Chrys., Thdrt.

[2] **προωρισας** D*P. [3] **Χρ. Ιησ.** B, Chr.; **Χρ.** Or., Hil.

parallel passage in Col. i. 22 is followed immediately by a reference to continuing "in the faith, grounded and stedfast, and not moved away from the hope of the Gospel". Something depends, however, on the position of the following **ἐν ἀγάπῃ,** on which see below.—**κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ**: *before Him;* that is, before God. Read **αὐτοῦ,** not (as Harl., etc.) **αὑτοῦ**; see Winer-Moul., *Gram.*, pp. 188, 189. So, too, in the parallel passage Col. i. 22. The present approbation of God is in view, not His future judgment. Light. thinks that God Himself is thus regarded as the great **μωμοσκόπος,** who inspects the victims and takes cognizance of blemishes. But this is to import a priestly notion which is not expressed in the context. This phrase might be specially appropriate to the idea of the *standing* or *relation* of believers as supposed to be conveyed by **ἀμώμους.** But it also suits the idea of *character*—**ἀμώμους** "in God's sight," "under the eye of God as Witness and Judge, and so *in truth and reality*". The terms **ἐνώπιον, κατενώπιον, κατέναντι** are also used in this sense in the NT, and do not appear to occur in profane Greek. They are peculiar to the LXX, the *Apocrypha*, and the NT. All three are used by Paul, **κατενώπιον** and **κατέναντι** sparingly (the former only here and in Col. i. 22, the latter in Rom. iv. 17; 2 Cor. ii. 17, xii. 19); most frequently **ἐνώπιον** (Rom. iii. 20, xii. 17, xiv. 22; 1 Cor. i. 29; 2 Cor. iv. 2, etc.), which is also much employed in Luke and Revelation, never in Matthew or Mark.—**ἐν ἀγάπῃ**: *in love.* What does this qualify? The divine *election*, say some (Œc., etc.). But the remoteness of the **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** from the **ἐξελέξατο** makes this, if not an impracticable, at least a less likely connection. It is possible, indeed, also to retain the connection of the **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** with ver. 4 and yet give it the sense of the *Divine* love, if we take it to qualify not the **ἐξελέξατο** alone, but the whole clause which it concludes. In that case the idea would be that the electing act and the object it had in view, namely holiness and blamelessness on our part, were both due to God's love and had their explanation in it. The choice, however, appears to be between attaching the clause to the preceding **ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους** and attaching it to the following **προορίσας.** Commentators and Versions are widely divided on the question. The former is the connection in LP, the Goth. and Copt. Vv., the Vulg., the texts of Stephens, WH, and the Revisers, and it is preferred by Eras., Luth., Beza, Calv., Grot., Wetst., Alf., Light. The latter is the connection in the Syr.-P, and is followed by LTTr *marg.*, RV *marg.*, Orig., Chrys., Thdrt., Theophy., August., Beng., Harl., de Wette, Olsh., Hof., Bleek., Mey., Ell., V. Sod., Haupt, Abbott, etc. The propriety of understanding the **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** as meant to qualify the **προορίσας** is urged on such grounds as these—that the Pauline Epistles furnish no other instance of **ἅγιος** or **ἄμωμος** having attached to it any *grace* or *virtue* defined by **ἐν** as the form in which the holiness or blamelessness shows itself (Haupt); that it is befitting that the *love* which is its principle and ground should get emphatic expression when the Divine **προορισμός** is first introduced (Ell., etc.); that this connection is most in harmony with the ascription of praise (Mey.), and with the genius of the paragraph as a whole, which is concerned with what God is to us rather than what we are required to be to Him. On the other hand in support of attaching the **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** to the preceding, it is pointed out that in view of the subsequent **κατ' εὐδοκίαν** there is less reason for introducing **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** in so emphatic a position before the **προορίσας**; that, if not in the Pauline Epistles themselves, yet elsewhere both within and without the NT we have instances analogous to the connection of **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** with **ἀμώμους** here—*e.g.*, 2 Pet. iii. 14, **ἀμώμητοι . . . ἐν εἰρήνῃ**; Jud. 24, **ἀμώμους ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει**; *Clem. Rom.*, 50, **ἵνα ἐν ἀγάπῃ εὑρεθῶμεν δίχα προσκλίσεως ἀνθρωπίνης ἄμωμοι** (cited

by Light., *Notes; ut sup.*, 313), and above all that it is Paul's usual, if not constant, habit to place **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** *after* the clause it qualifies (Eph. iv. 2, 15, 16, v. 2; Col. ii. 2; 1 Thess. v. 13; *cf.* also, though in association with other terms, 1 Tim. iv. 12; 2 Tim. i. 13). On the whole this connection is to be preferred, and the **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** will then define the holiness and blamelessness, which are the end and object of God's election of us, as having their truth and perfection in the supreme Christian grace of love.

Ver. 5. **προορίσας ἡμᾶς**: *having foreordained us.* Better, *in that He foreordained us.* Wycl. gives "hath bifore ordeyned us"; Tynd. and Cranmer, "ordeyned us"; and so the RV, "foreordained". But the Genevan, the Rhemish and the AV, following the *praedestinavit* of the Vulg., give "did predestinate us," "hath predestinated us," "having predestinated us". While in Romans and Ephesians the AV adopts "predestinated," in 1 Cor. ii. 7 it has "foreordained". It is best to adopt *foreordain* all through, as **προορίζειν** means to *determine before.* The verb seems not to occur either in the LXX or in any Greek writer before Paul. It is found in Heliodorus, Ignatius, etc. In the NT it is always used of God as determining from eternity, sometimes with the further definition **πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων** (1 Cor. ii. 7)—decreeing to do something (Acts iv. 28); foreordaining things or persons (1 Cor. ii. 7; Rom. viii. 29 ff.); or, as here, appointing one beforehand to something. The **πρὸ** in the compound verb expresses the fact that the decree is prior to the realisation of its object. The aor. part. may be taken as *temporal* (so the Syr.-Phil.), in which case the *foreordination* would be something prior (not in *time*, indeed, but in *logical* order) to the *election*, and the election would be defined as proceeding on the foreordination (Ell., Alf., etc.). But it may also be taken as *modal*, not prior to the election but coincident with it, and expressing the mode of its action or the form which it took—"in that He foreordained us" (Mey., etc.). On this use of the aor. part. see Winer-Moul., *Gram.*, p. 430. This is the more probable view, because no real distinction appears to be made between the **ἐκλογή** and the **προορισμός** beyond what may be suggested by the **ἐκ** in the one and the **πρό** in the other; the idea in the **ἐκλογή** being understood to be that of the *mass from* which the selection is made, and that of the **προορισμός** the *priority* of the decree (Ell.). It is also to be noticed (*cf.* Mey.) that both in Romans (viii. 29) and in 1 Peter (i. 2) it is the **πρόγνωσις**, not the **προορισμός**, that is represented as antecedent to the election or as forming its ground. This Divine **προορισμός**, like the Divine **ἐκλογή**, has in the Pauline writings, in which it receives its loftiest, most complete, and most unqualified statement, not a speculative but an intensely practical interest, especially with regard to two things of most immediate personal concern—the believer's incentive to live in newness and holiness of life (*cf.* ii. 10), and his encouragement to rest in the Divine salvation as for him an assured salvation.—**εἰς υἱοθεσίαν**: *unto adoption.* Or, as the RV gives it, following the *adoptio filiorum* of the Vulg., "unto adoption as sons". It is a Pauline term, and conveys an idea distinct from that of *sonship* and explanatory of it. The sonship of believers, the fact that they are children of God, with the privileges and responsibilities belonging to such, finds frequent expression in the NT writings. But it is only in the Pauline Epistles that the specific idea of **υἱοθεσία** occurs, and there in five instances (Rom. viii. 15, 23, ix. 4; Gal. iv. 5; Eph. i. 5). In one case it is applied to the special relation of Israel to God (Rom. ix. 4); thrice (Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iv. 5; Eph. i. 5) it is used of the present position of believers in Christ; once (Rom. viii. 23) it refers to their future consummation, the resurrection of life that will be the full manifestation of their sonship. It is a term of *relation*, expressing our sonship in respect of *standing*. It appears to be taken from the Roman custom, with which Paul could not fail to be acquainted. Among the Jews there were cases of informal adoption, as in the instance of Mordecai and Esther (Esth. ii. 7). But adoption in the sense of the legal transference of a child to a family to which it did not belong by birth had no place in the Jewish law. In Roman law, on the other hand, provision was made for the transaction known as *adoptio*, the taking of a child who was not one's child by birth to be his son, and *arrogatio*, the transference of a son who was independent, as by the death of his proper father, to another father by solemn public act of the people. Thus among the Romans a citizen might receive a child who was not his own by birth into his family and give him his name, but he could do so only by a formal act, attested by witnesses, and the son thus adopted had

in all its entirety the position of a child by birth, with all the rights and all the obligations pertaining to that. By "adoption," therefore, Paul does not mean the bestowal of the full privileges of the family on those who are sons by nature, but the acceptance into the family of those who do not by nature belong to it, and the placing of those who are not sons originally and by right in the relation proper to those who are sons by birth. Hence **νἱοθεσία** is never affirmed of Christ; for he alone is Son of God by nature. So Paul regards our sonship, not as lying in the natural relation in which men stand to God as His children, but as implying a new relation of grace, founded on a covenant relation of God and on the work of Christ (Gal. iv. 5 ff.). —**διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ**: *through Jesus Christ;* in this case not *in* Christ but *through* Him. That is, it is through the mediation of Christ that our adoption as sons is realised; *cf.* Gal. iii. 26-iv. 7. Elsewhere the *ethical* side of the sonship is expressed. For God not only brings us into the relation of sons, but makes us sons in inward reality and character, giving us the filial mind, leading us by His Spirit, translating us into the liberty of the glory of His children (Rom. viii. 12, 14, 21; Gal. iv. 6).—**εἰς αὐτόν**: *unto Himself*, that is, not unto *Christ*, as De Wette, V. Soden, etc., still think, but unto *God*. Here, as in ver. 4, we read **αὐτοῦ**, not **αὑτοῦ** (as Stephens, Mill, Griesbach, etc., put it), the writer giving it as from his own standpoint. How is this to be understood? It may mean simply that God Himself is the Father to whom we are brought into filial relation by adoption. In that case the point would be the glory of the adoption, inasmuch as it is God Himself and none less than He who becomes our Father by it and to whom the foreordination into the position of sons looks. Or it may be the deeper idea that God Himself is the *end* of the foreordination, as Christ is its medium or channel. The **εἰς** is not to be confused with **ἐν**, nor would the idea thus be reduced to that of simple possession. Here the **εἰς** may rather have its most definite force, expressing the *goal* of all. The final object of God's foreordination of us to the standing of sons is to bring us to Himself, into perfect fellowship with Him, into adoring, loving relation to Himself as the true End and Object of our being.—**κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ**: *according to the good pleasure of His will.* Wycl. gives "by the purpose of His will"; Rhem., "according to the purpose of His will"; Tynd., "according to the pleasure of His will"; Cran., Gen., AV, "according to the good pleasure of His will". The noun **εὐδοκία** (Vulg.-Clem., *beneplacitum*) is a biblical term. It is not current in profane Greek, but represents the רָצוֹן of the OT (especially in the Psalms), and occurs a good many times in Sir. In the NT it is found thrice in the Gospels (Matt. xi. 26; Luke ii. 14, x. 21), and six times in the Pauline Epistles (Rom. x. 1; Eph. i. 5, 9; Phil. i. 15, ii. 13; 2 Thess. i. 11), but nowhere else. It has the sense (*a*) of *will* (Matt. xi. 26; Luke x. 21), passing into that of *desire* (Rom. x. 1); and (*b*) of *good will* (Luke ii. 14; Eph. i. 9; Phil. i. 15, ii. 13), passing into that of *delight* or *satisfaction* (2 Thess. i. 11). Here it is taken by most (Mey., De Wette, Stier., Alf., Ell., Abbott, etc.) in the sense of *beneplacitum*, *purpose*, *sovereign counsel*, as equivalent to **κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ** in ver. 11. Light., *e.g.*, is of opinion that, while its central idea is "satisfaction," it will "only then mean 'benevolence' when the context points to some person *towards whom* the satisfaction is felt". He refers to **ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα** in Matt. iii. 17, and contends that without such indication of a personal object "the satisfaction is felt in the action itself, so that the word is used absolutely, and signifies 'good pleasure,' in the sense of 'desire,' 'purpose,' 'design'" (*Notes, ut sup.*, 314). But in the Pauline Epistles, when it is used of God, it is a term of grace, expressing "good pleasure" as *kind* intent, *gracious* will, and even when used of man it conveys the same idea of *goodness* (Rom. x. 1; Phil. i. 15). Nor does the connotation appear to be different in the occurrences in the Gospels (Matt. xi. 26; Luke ii. 14; x. 21). In the present passage it is only in relation to the grace of His dealings with sinful men that reference is made to the will of God. The clause in question presents that grace in the particular aspect of its sovereign, unmerited action. It adds the last note to the statement of the wonders of the Divine election by expressing the fact that that election and God's foreordination of us unto adoption are not due to any desert in us or anything outside God Himself, but are acts of His own pure goodness, originating only and wholly in the freedom of His own thoughts and loving counsel.

Ver. 6. **εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ**: *to the praise of the glory of his*

αὐτοῦ, 6. εἰς [w]ἔπαινον [x]δόξης[1] τῆς[2] χάριτος αὐτοῦ, [y]ἧς[3] [z]ἐχαρί- w See Phil. i. 11; 1 Pet. i. 7.
τωσεν ἡμᾶς [a]ἐν τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ, 7. [b]ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν[4] τὴν [c]ἀπολύτρωσιν x = Rom. iii. 23; Col. i. 27. y attr., Acts i. 1 reff. z Luke i. 28 only †; Sir. xviii. 17; Ps. xvii. 25 Symm. a Vv. 3, 4 reff. b Col. i. 14; 1 Cor. i. 30. c Luke xxi. 28; Rom. iii. 24; 1 Cor. i. 30; Col. i. 14; Heb. ix. 15, xi. 35; Dan. iv. 32, Chis. MS.; see Ps. lxviii. 18; Isa. lxiii. 4.

[1] της δοξης DE. [2] της om. Dam.

[3] εν η, with ℵ[3]DEF (om. η) GKL, most MSS., Syr.-P., Bas., Chr. (*hoc loco*), Thdrt., Dam., Victorin., Ambrstr.; text AB 6, 17, 23[1], 47, 57, al., Orig. Chr.; η Thl.; και ι. After ηγαπ. insert υιω αυτου D[1]EFG, syr.*, d, e, f, g, vg., Syr.-P., Goth., etc.

[4] εσχομεν ℵD, Copt. (*accepimus*), Eth., Iren.[310]; text ℵ[3]AB[1]D[2, 3]EFGKLP, d, e, f, g, Vulg., Syr.[utr.], Arm., Goth., Iren.[293], Or., Cyr., Thdt., Victorin., Jer.

grace. Twice again in the same context we have the phrase "to the praise of his glory" (vv. 12, 14). Here it is the glory specifically of God's grace, and the praise of that is now stated to be the ultimate end of God's foreordination of us unto adoption, as our adoption itself has been declared to be the object of the foreordination. God's final purpose in His eternal determinations, and the supreme end to which all that He wills regarding us looks, are the manifestation and adoring recognition of His grace in its gloriousness. So Chrys. puts it briefly **ἵνα ἡ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ δόξα δειχθῇ**. The phrase means more than "the praise of his glorious grace". It expresses the setting forth on God's part, and the joyful confession on man's part, of what the Divine grace in these eternal counsels is in the quality of its splendour, its magnificence. That this is the idea is shown by the subsequent mention of the "riches" of the same grace (ver. 7).—**ἐν ᾗ ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς**: *with which he freely gifted us*; literally, *with which he graced us*. The AV follows Beza's *in qua nos acceptos sibi effecit* in rendering it "wherein he made us accepted". The RV, which gives "wherewith he endued us" in the margin, deals better with it in the text, "which he freely bestowed on us". The reading **ἐν ᾗ** of the TR, supported by such MSS. as DEGL, the mass of the cursives, the Vulg., etc., must give place to **ἧς**, which is given by ℵBA, Eth., Syr., etc., and is adopted by LT (eighth ed.) TrWHRV. The **ἧς** is by attraction for **ἣν** (*cf.* similar genitives by attraction in iv. 1; 2 Cor. i. 4), the explanation being found in the influence of such usages as **μάχην μάχεσθαι, ὕβριν ὑβρίζειν, κλῆσιν καλεῖν, χάριν χαριτοῦν**. See Win.-Moult., *Gram.*, p. 203; Buttm., *Gram.*, p. 289. The verb **χαριτόω**, following the analogy of other verbs in **-οω**, means *gratia aliquem afficere*. But this may have two senses (*cf.* Harl., Ell.), either to *make one agreeable, possessed of grace* (Sir. xviii. 17; Ps. xvii. 26 (Symmachus), Clem. Alex., *Paed.*, iii., 11), or to *bestow grace on one*, to *compass one with favour* (Test. xii Patr., Jos. i.). The verb is of rare occurrence, whether within or without the NT. It is commonest in ecclesiastical and Byzantine Greek. In the NT it is found only twice, here and in Luke i. 28. In both instances some would give it the former sense. In the present passage, *e.g.*, Chrys. makes it **ἐπεραστοὺς ἐποίησε**, and so substantially Cornel. a Lapide, Bisping, and various RC interpreters. The latter sense, however, is rightly preferred by Beng., Ell., Alf., Light., Mey., Haupt, etc., as more in harmony with the general sense of **χάρις** in the Pauline Epistles, and with the fact that the main idea in the context is what God in His gratuitous goodness does for us.—**ἐν τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ**: *in the Beloved*. The doubtful explanatory term **υἱῷ αὐτοῦ** is added by some ancient authorities (DEFG, Vulg., Goth., Jer., etc.). Again it is not "*through* him," but "*in* him". The grace is bestowed in and with Christ Himself. It is in the gift of the Son that the gift of grace becomes ours and that the splendour of the grace is seen. The designation **ὁ ἠγαπημένος** as applied to Christ is peculiar to this one passage so far as the NT is concerned. In the NT its nearest equivalent is the title **τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ** in the somewhat similar passage in Col. i. 13. *Cf.* also **ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός** (Matt. iii. 17, xvii. 5; Mk. i. 11, ix. 7; Luke iii. 22, ix. 35), **ὁ ἀγαπητός μου** (Matt. xii. 18); and in the OT Ps. xxvii. 6 (LXX); Is. v. 1. Outside the NT the term **ὁ ἠγαπημένος αὐτοῦ** is used of Christ in the *Ep. of Barn.* (3, 4). Light. points also to similar designations in Ignatius, Clem. Rom., and the *Ascensio Isaiae* (*Notes, ut sup.*, 316).

Ver. 7. **ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρω-**

σιν: *in whom we have the redemption.* Here and in the parallel passage in Col. i. 14 the readings vary between **ἔχομεν** and **ἴσχομεν.** In the present sentence, though **ἴσχομεν** has the support of some good authorities (ℵD, Copt., Eth., etc.), the weight of documentary evidence is largely on the side of **ἔχομεν** (Bℵ^{c}AD^{b}EFGKL, Vulg., Syr., Goth., etc.). What is in view, therefore, is something possessed now, and the writer describes that as **τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν**—"*the* redemption," *i.e.*, the redemption familiar to every Christian, long expected and now accomplished. This **ἀπολύτρωσις** is viewed sometimes as a thing of the future (Luke xxi. 28; Rom. viii. 23; Eph. iv. 30; and probably also Eph. i. 14; 1 Cor. i. 30); sometimes as a present possession (as here; Rom. iii. 24; Col. i. 14; Heb. ix. 15). That the **ἀπολύτρωσις** here is a redemption not from the power or pollution of sin, but from its guilt, its condemnation, its penalty, is made plain by the defining clause which follows, identifying it with the *forgiveness* of sins. This is not the only aspect in which it is presented in the Pauline Epistles. The verb **λυτροῦσθαι** is applied there to a redemption from "all iniquity," Tit. ii. 14, as in 1 Pet. i. 18 it is used of a redemption from a "vain manner of life". But it is the primary aspect of the word and its cognates, and the one that is at the foundation of the other. The noun **ἀπολύτρωσις** is of rare occurrence, found only in a few passages in profane Greek (Plut., *Pomp.*, xxiv., 2; Joseph., *Antiq.*, xii., ii., 3; Diod., *Frag.*, lib. xxxvii., 5, 3 (Dindorf.); Philo, *Quod omn. prob. lib. sit.*, § 17); and in the NT itself only ten times in all. The verb **ἀπολυτροῦσθαι** is not found in the NT at all; the simple **λυτροῦν, λυτροῦσθαι** thrice (1 Pet. i. 18; Luke xxiv. 21; Tit. ii. 14) and the noun **λύτρωσις** thrice (Luke i. 68, ii. 38; Heb. ix. 12). The proper idea is that of a release, deliverance, or redemption effected by payment of a price or ransom (**λύτρον**). It is argued indeed that this idea cannot be said to be the essential or primary idea of **ἀπολύτρωσις,** because it is used in connections in which the notion of a *payment* is not in view (so Abbott); and that, therefore, we are not entitled to say that it means more than *deliverance.* It is true that, as is the case with most words, the definite, specific sense passes at times into the more general sense of "deliverance" (Heb. xi. 35; *cf.* Exod. vi. 6). But in profane Greek and in the LXX the primary sense of the verb, the noun, and their cognates is that of a redemption effected by payment of a price, or a release granted on receiving a price (Plut., *Pomp.*, 24; Plato, *Leges*, 11, p. 919(*a*); Polyb., xxii., 21, 8; Exod. xxi. 8; Zeph. iii. 1); and in the Pauline Epistles it denotes the deliverance accomplished at the cost of Christ's death from the Divine wrath and the penalty of sin. So it is understood, *e.g.*, by Origen, *in loc.*, Mey., Alf., Ell., etc.; and as the **ἄφεσιν κ.τ.λ.** shows that the "redemption" here in view is one in relation to the *guilt* or *penalty* of sin, so the **διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ** shows that it is a redemption by payment of a price. This is consistent with Paul's doctrine of the Divine wrath, redemption, propitiation, expiation, and the curse of the law (Rom. i. 18, iii. 23, v. 5 ff.; 1 Cor. vi. 20; Gal. iv. 4). It has its foundation also in Christ's own declaration of the purpose of His coming, *viz.*, to give His life a **λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν** (Matt. xx. 28; Mk. x. 45).—**διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ**: *through His blood.* Christ's "blood," therefore, is that by which the redemption is effected—the price (**τιμή,** 1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23) of the deliverance, the "ransom" that had to be paid for it (Matt. xx. 28; Mk. x. 45). The same idea appears in the teaching both of Peter and of John (1 Pet. i. 18; Rev. v. 9). The term occurs repeatedly in the NT, and in various forms—**τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ** (1 Cor. x. 16), **τοῦ Κυρίου** (1 Cor. xi. 27), **τοῦ ἀρνίου** (Rev. vii. 14, xii. 11), **τοῦ σταυροῦ** (Col. i. 20). What is its import? It means more than the *death* of Christ. It means that death in a particular aspect—as a sacrifice, a death having a definite efficacy. It is a *sacrificial* term, based on the use of the blood of victims, offered under the OT Law, for purposes of purification and expiation (Lev. xvii. 11; Heb. ix. 7, 12, 18-22, 25, x. 4, xi. 28, xiii. 11). It looks back also to Christ's own words in the institution of the Supper (Matt. xxvi. 28; Mk. xiv. 29), and denotes the ratification of a new relation between God and men by a new covenant sacrifice. It is used with reference to the purchase of the Church (Acts xx. 28; Rev. v. 9), the grace of access to God (Heb. x. 19), the admission of the Gentiles on equal terms with the Jews (Eph. ii. 13), the reconciliation of all things to God (Col. i. 20); but also and most definitely to the changed condition of sinful men, and that most frequently on the objective side, as a new relation. As in the Levitical system there was a purificatory use of blood in the case of certain matters

of uncleanness (Lev. xiv. 5, 50), so in the NT the "blood" of Christ is used with reference to the ethical power of Christ's death in purifying or in overcoming (1 Pet. i. 19; 1 John i. 7; Rev. xii. 11). But its special use is with reference to justification (Rev. v. 9), the position of non-condemnation (Heb. xii. 24), the cleansing of the conscience (Heb. ix. 14), the making of peace between God and the world (Col. i. 20), the manifestation of the righteousness of God in the passing over of sins (Rom. iii. 25), the remission of sins (Heb. ix. 22). Its primary idea, as is shown by usage and by OT analogy, is not that of renewing power or moral effect, but that of expiation, the removal of guilt, the restoration of broken relations with God. The important passage indeed in Lev. xvii. 11, which speaks of the "blood" as reserved by Jehovah for the altar, for the purpose of "covering" sin or making "atonement" for it, and declares that the atonement is made by the blood by reason of "the *life* of the flesh" that is in it, has been held by not a few (including Bähr and other distinguished scholars) to express only the idea of self-surrender. On this ground the piacular efficacy of the OT sacrifices, and, therefore, of the sacrifice of Christ, has been denied. But the "covering" of sin or making "atonement" for it by sacrifice, is in many passages of the OT definitely connected with the *forgiveness* of sin (Lev. iv. 26, v. 18, etc.); the passage in Lev. xvii. 11 embodies the idea that "life" is the offering by which the transgressor "covers" his sin or finds forgiveness for it; and in passages like the present it is this kind of efficacy that is definitely ascribed to the "blood" of Christ.

The attempt has been made to prove that this great phrase, "the blood of Christ," covers two ideas which ought to be distinguished, namely, that of the blood as *shed* and that of the blood as *offered*, or *death* and *life* as two different conceptions. Thus the phrase in question is interpreted as setting forth Christ's *life* in two distinct aspects, namely, as *laid down* in the act of dying and as *liberated* by the same act and made *available* for us, so that we are saved by having it communicated to us. So West., *Epistle to the Hebrews*, pp. 293 ff.; *Epistles of St. John*, pp. 34 ff. But neither in the present paragraph nor in any other Pauline passage is there anything to bear this out. Paul, indeed, speaks largely of the Christ who having died is now alive, and of what is effected for us by His *life* (Rom. v. 8-11; Phil. iii. 10, etc.). But what the Living Christ does for us in the forgiveness of sin, or in the subjugation of sin, is done as the power of what He did in dying for us.—**τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων**: *the forgiveness of our trespasses*. The term **ἄφεσις**, while used occasionally in the general sense of *release* (Luke iv. 18; *cf.* Isa. lxi. 1), expresses statedly the idea of the *letting go* of sin (**ἀφιέναι τὴν ὀφειλήν**, Matt. xviii. 32; **ἀφιέναι τὰ ὀφειλήματα, τὰ παραπτώματα**, Matt. vi. 12, 14, etc.), its dismissal or pardon, in the sense of the remission of its penalty (Matt. xxvi. 28; Mark i. 4; Luke i. 77, iii. 3, xxiv. 47; Acts ii. 38, v. 31, x. 43, xiii. 38, etc.), and as distinguished from **πάρεσις**, the *praetermission* or passing by of sin in simple forbearance (Rom. iii. 25). The term **παράπτωμα** describes sin as *lapse*, *misdeed*, *trespass* (nearly equivalent to **παράβασις**, *transgression*, and **ἁμάρτημα**, *evil deed*, these differing not so much in their use as rather in the metaphors underlying them), as distinguished from **ἀνομία**, *lawlessness* or *iniquity*, **ἀδικία**, *unrighteousness* or *wrong*, and **ἁμαρτία**, which is applied not only to *acts* of sin, but to sin as a *power*, a *habit*, a *condition* (*cf.* Trench, *Syn.*, § lxvi.; Fritzsche, *Rom.*, i. 289; Light., *Notes*, *ut sup.*, on *Rom.*, v., 20).—**κατὰ τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ**: *according to the riches of His grace*. The readings vary between **τὸν πλοῦτον** (TR, following א³D³KL, etc.) and **τὸ πλοῦτος** (LTTrWHRV, following Bא¹AD¹, etc.). The masculine is the usual form, but the neuter is found in the best MSS. in several passages in the Pauline Epistles (2 Cor. viii. 2; Eph. i. 7, ii. 7, iii. 8, 16; Phil. iv. 19; Col. i. 27, ii. 2). Elsewhere in the NT the masculine prevails. Winer explains the exchange between the two forms as due to the popular language, as **ὁ** and **τὸ πλοῦτος** are used indifferently in modern Greek (Winer-Moult., *Gram.*, p. 76). The great word **χάρις**, "grace," which has been used twice already in these opening verses, touches the pulse of all Paul's teaching on the redemption of sinful man. It has a large place in all his Epistles, and not least in this one. For here it meets us at every turning-point in the great statement of the Divine counsel, the securities of the forgiveness of sin, the way of salvation. While it has the occasional and subordinate senses of *loveliness* (Col. iv. 6), *favour* or *good will*, whether of God or of man (Luke ii. 40, 52; Acts ii. 47, iv. 33, vii. 10, etc.), in the Pauline writings it has the particular sense of *free gift*, *undeserved bounty*, and is used specially

d here only; see Col. i. 14. e Ch. ii. 7, iii. 8, 16; Phil. iv. 19; Col. ii. 2. 2 Cor. iv. 15, ix. 8; 1 Thess. iii. 12. f attr., Rom. iv. 17; Col. i. 23; ch. ii. 4, 10 al. g trans., h=ver. 17; Col. i. 9, 28.

διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, τὴν [d] ἄφεσιν τῶν [d] παραπτωμάτων, κατὰ τὸ [e] πλοῦτος [1] τῆς χάριτος [2] αὐτοῦ, 8. [f] ἧς [3] [g] ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς ἡμᾶς [h] ἐν

[1] το πλουτος ℵ*ABD*EFGP 31, 47, 59, 67; το πληθος 17; τον πλουτον ℵ[3]D[3]KL, etc., Or., Cyr., Bas., Chrys., Euthal., etc.

[2] For χαριτος, χρηστοτητος A 109, Copt.; text BDG, f, etc.

[3] For ης, *quae* d, e, f, g, Ambrst.

of the goodness of God which bestows favour on those who have no claim or merit in themselves (Rom. iii. 24, v. 17, 20; 1 Cor. xv. 10; Gal. i. 15, etc., etc.), or of that free favour of God as a power which renews men and sustains them in the Christian life, aiding their efforts, keeping them from falling, securing their progress in holiness (2 Cor. iv. 15; vi. 1; 2 Thess. i. 12, etc.). The *freeness* of this Divine favour in the form of grace, the *unmerited* nature of the Divine goodness, is what Paul most frequently magnifies with praise and wonder. Here it is the mighty measure of the largesse, the grace in its quality of *riches*, that is introduced. This magnificent conception of the *wealth* of the grace that is bestowed on us by God and that which is in Christ for us, is a peculiarly Pauline idea. It meets us, indeed, elsewhere (*cf.* the *plenteous* redemption of the Psalmist, Ps. cxxx. 7; the *multitude* of the Divine mercies, Ps. lxix. 13, 16, and loving kindnesses, Ps. lxiii. 7; the *fulness* of Christ, John i. 16; Col. i. 19, etc.); but nowhere so frequently or with such insistence as with Paul. *Cf.* the *riches* of God's goodness (Rom. ii. 4), His glory (Rom. ix. 23), His wisdom (Rom. xi. 33), His mercy (Eph. ii. 4), the glory of His inheritance (Eph. i. 18), the glory of the mystery (Col. i. 27); also the exceeding riches of His grace (Eph. ii. 7), his riches in glory by Christ Jesus (Phil. iv. 19), the riches of the pre-incarnate Christ (2 Cor. viii. 9), the riches of Christ the Lord (Rom. x. 12), the unsearchable riches of Christ (Eph. iii. 8). That our redemption cost so great a price, the blood of Christ, is the supreme evidence of the riches of the Divine grace. And the measure of what God does for us is nothing less than the limitless wealth of His loving favour.

Ver. 8. **ἧς ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς ἡμᾶς**: *which he made to abound towards us.* Both in profane and Biblical Greek **περισσεύειν** is usually intrans. It is so used in the vast majority of cases in the Pauline Epistles (Rom. v. 15; 1 Cor. xiv. 12; 2 Cor. i. 5, viii. 2, ix. 12; Phil. i. 26, etc.). In later Greek, however, it has also, though not frequently, the trans. sense, and there are some instances of this also in the NT (Luke xv. 17, according to the better reading; 2 Cor. iv. 15, ix. 8; 1 Thess. iii. 12). Here, therefore, two interpretations are possible, *viz.*, "wherewith he abounded" (as in Syr., Vulg., Arm., AV, RV marg., etc.), or "which he made to abound" (as in Goth., Eth., RV, etc.). The latter sense, that of furnishing richly so that there is not only enough but much more, is on the whole in better harmony with the context. It is also supported by grammar, inasmuch as it is uncertain whether the NT presents any instance of attraction where the genitive of the relative represents the dative. Such attraction is possible in classical Greek (*cf.* G. Krüger, *Untersuch.*, p. 274; Jelf, *Gram.*, 822; Winer-Moult., *Gram.*, p. 204); but the instances referred to in the NT (Rom. iv. 7; 1 Tim. iv. 6) may admit of another explanation. It is also possible, indeed, to take the **ἧς**, not as a case of attraction, but as under the immediate regimen of **ἐπερίσσευσεν**. For there are at least some instances of **περισσεύειν τινος** in the sense of abounding *in* something; *cf.* **ἵνα . . . παντὸς χαρίσματος περισσεύῃς** in Ignat., *Pol.*, 2, and **περισσεύουσιν ἄρτων** in Luke xv. 17 (the reading of the TR with ℵDQR, etc.; **περισσεύονται**, however, being accepted by TrWHRV with BAP, etc.). The transitive sense, however, is further favoured by the force of the following **γνωρίσας**, as Winer points out. The **εἰς ἡμᾶς**, expressing the objects to whom the "abounding" is directed, is like the **εἰς τοὺς πολλούς** of Rom. v. 15, the **εἰς ἡμᾶς** of 2 Cor. i. 5, the **εἰς ὑμᾶς** of 2 Cor. ix. 8. In the last-named passage, indeed, **περισσεύειν** occurs both in the sense of *making* to *abound* and in that of *abounding*, and in both cases, though with different shades of meaning, it is followed by **εἰς**.—**ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ φρονήσει**: *in all wisdom and prudence.* The clause expresses the particular forms in which God made His

grace to abound towards us, or the gifts in which His abounding grace was to be seen, namely, those of insight and practical intelligence or discernment with regard to the deep things of His saving counsel. There is considerable difference of opinion, however, with respect to the connection of the clause, its application, and the precise import of its terms. By some (Theod., Griesb., etc.) the words are attached to the following **γνωρίσας** and taken to define the way in which God made known the "mystery of His will". But the reason already given, drawn from Paul's usage, for attaching the **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** (ver. 4) to the statement preceding it, holds good also here. Not a few (Rückert, De Wette, Alf., etc.) understand the clause to refer to *God*, and to express the thought that the supremacy of His wisdom was seen in the bestowal of His grace so abundantly on us, that it was "in His manifold wisdom and prudence, manifested in all ways possible for us, that He poured out His grace upon us" (Alf.). But it is difficult to adjust the terms to such a use. For it is doubtful whether **φρόνησις** in the sense which it bears here can be predicated of God. The instances which are cited (Prov. iii. 19; Jer. x. 12) are extremely few. They are also of doubtful relevancy, inasmuch as the **φρόνησις** in these passages represents a Hebrew word with a somewhat different idea, rendered by the RV "understanding". Neither is the **πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ** (Eph. iii. 10) a valid analogy, the thought expressed there being that of the many and various ways in which the Divine wisdom is manifested and realised. The same must be said of the phrase **φρόνησις θεοῦ** in the narrative of Solomon's decision (1 Kings iii. 28); for it expresses a prudence or intelligence given to Solomon by God or divine in quality. Even were it more certain than it is that there is biblical warrant for affirming **φρόνησις** of God, the **πάσῃ** puts that reference out of the question here; **πᾶς** being an extensive, not an intensive, definition, expressing not the *highest* wisdom and prudence, but *all possible* wisdom and prudence, *every kind* of such attributes (*cf.* Winer-Moult., p. 137). It is true that there are cases in classical Greek which might entitle us to take **πᾶσα σοφία** as equivalent to **πᾶσα ἡ σοφία**, "the whole of wisdom," "the sum of wisdom" (*cf.* Kühner, *Gram.*, ii., § 465; *Anm.*, 8). But there does not appear to be any certain example of that in NT Greek. Further, it is the *grace* of God that is magnified in the paragraph, and that not in respect of other qualities in God Himself, but in respect of what it does for us. Hence most (Harl., Mey., Ell., Abb., Haupt, etc.) understand the clause to refer not to God the Giver, but to us the receivers. This is borne out also by the **ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει** of Col. i. 9; by the place assigned to Christian wisdom in the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians; and also to some extent by such partial parallels as these: **ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ** (Col. iii. 16); **ἐπλουτίσθητε ἐν αὐτῷ, ἐν παντὶ λόγῳ καὶ πάσῃ γνώσει** (1 Cor. i. 5), etc.

There remains, however, the question as to the precise sense of the two nouns. **Σοφία** is of frequent occurrence in the NT generally and in the Pauline writings in particular; **φρόνησις** occurs only twice in the whole NT, *viz.*, in Luke i. 17 (where the RV renders it "wisdom") and here. As in the present passage the two nouns are also conjoined in 1 Kings iii. 12, iv. 29; Prov. i. 2, viii. 1; Dan. i. 17, ii. 21, 23. So, too, in Joseph., *Antiq.*, ii., 5, 7, viii., 7, 5. There is a distinction between them which is variously put in Greek and Roman literature. Aristotle, *e.g.*, defines **σοφία** as **ἐπιστήμη καὶ νοῦς τῶν τιμιωτάτων τῇ φύσει**, and **φρόνησις** as **περὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα καὶ περὶ ὧν ἔστι βουλεύσασθαι** (*Eth. Nic.*, vi., 7). Plato deals with **φρόνησις** as the wisdom of action, prudential wisdom or sagacity (*Laws*, i., 631 C; 632 E, etc.), and as the faculty by which we judge **τί πρακτέον καὶ τί οὐ πρακτέον** ([Plato], *Def.*, 411). Philo takes **σοφία** to relate **πρὸς θεραπείαν Θεοῦ** and **φρόνησις** to relate **πρὸς ἀνθρωπίνου βίου διοίκησιν** (*De Prom. et Poen.*, 14). Cicero again describes the former as *rerum divinarum et humanarum scientia* and the latter as *rerum expetendarum fugiendarumque scientia* (*Off.*, i., 43); while others explain **σοφία** as **ἐπιστήμη θείων τε καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων** and **φρόνησις** as **ἐπιστήμη ἀγαθῶν καὶ κακῶν** (Sext. Emp., p. 720; Plut., *Mor.*, 1066 D). In all these definitions **σοφία** is the larger idea, wisdom in the most general sense, and **φρόνησις** is the secondary idea, expressing a particular result or application of **σοφία**. So it seems to be also substantially with the Biblical use of the terms. **Σοφία** is the collective moral intelligence, "insight into the true nature of things" (Light.), and in the Pauline Epistles it is this intelligence in especial as knowledge of the Divine plan of salvation long hidden and now revealed; while **φρόνησις** is the prac-

i Luke i. 17 only; 3 Kings iii. 28. **πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ** [i] **φρονήσει** [1] 9. [k] **γνωρίσας** [2] **ἡμῖν τὸ** [l] **μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ,** [3] **κατὰ τὴν** [m] **εὐδοκίαν αὐτοῦ, ἣν** [n] **προέθετο** [o] **ἐν**

k John xvii. 26; Ezek. xliv. 23; Eph. and Col. fr. l Ch. iii. 3, vi. 19 al.; Col. i. 26 al.; Mark iv. 11; Dan. ii. 29 al. m ver. 5 reff. n Rom. i. 13, iii. 25 only; Exod. xl. 4. o Vv. 3, 4 reff.

[1] For **φρονησ., γνωσει** 17; **συνεσει** 71.

[2] **γνωρισαι** FG 76, d, e, f, g, Vlg., Goth., Hil., Theophyl., Victorin., Ambrst., Aug., etc.

[3] **αυτου** om. DEFG, d, e, g, Goth., Copt., Tert., Victorin., Hil.

tical use of wisdom, the product of wisdom (*cf.* Prov. x. 23, **ἡ δὲ σοφία ἀνδρὶ τίκτει φρόνησιν**), "the right use and application of the **φρήν**" (Trench), the faculty of discerning the proper disposition or action. The riches, the abounding riches, of the grace expended on us stood revealed in the bestowal of these gifts of spiritual comprehension and practical discernment with reference to the deep things of the Divine Counsel and the Divine Revelation.

Ver. 9. **γνωρίσας ἡμῖν**: *having made known unto us.* Better, "in that He made known unto us". As in ver. 5 the aor. part. is *modal*, not *temporal*, expressing an act not conceived as prior to that intimated by the definite tense, but coincident with it and stating the way in which it took effect. The **ἡμῖν** means to us *Christians* generally, not to us *Apostles* particularly, and the knowledge in question is spiritual understanding or insight. It was in giving us to know a certain secret of His counsel that God made His grace to abound toward us in all wisdom and discernment. The revelation of this secret to our minds meant the bestowal on us of all that is implied in wisdom and intelligence.—**τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ**: *the mystery* (or *secret*) *of His will.* The gen. is the ordinary *gen. objecti*, the mystery *touching* or *concerning* His will; not the *gen. subjecti*, the mystery *originating* in His will, nor the *appositive* gen., as if it were simply another form for "His hidden will". The word **μυστήριον**, which in classical Greek meant something *secret*, especially the secrets of religion communicated only to the initiated and by them to be kept untold, is used in the Apocryphal books of things hidden, *e.g.*, the counsels of God (Wisd. ii. 22; Judith ii. 2), and in the NT occasionally of things not clear to the understanding (1 Cor. xiii. 2, xiv. 2), or of the mystic meaning of things — sayings, names, appearances (Eph. v. 32; Rev. i. 20, xvii. 5). But its distinctive sense in the NT is that of something once hidden and now revealed, a secret now open. In this sense it is applied to the Divine plan of redemption as a whole (Rom. xvi. 25; 1 Cor. ii. 7; Eph. vi. 19; Col. i. 26; 1 Tim. iii. 9, 16, etc.), or to particular things belonging to that Divine plan—the inclusion of the Gentiles (Rom. xi. 25; Eph. iii. 3, 9), the transformation of Christians alive on earth at Christ's return (1 Cor. xv. 52), the union of Christ and the Church (Eph. v. 32). It does not convey the idea of something that we cannot take in or understand even when it is declared to us. It is peculiarly frequent in the kindred Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, ten out of the twenty-six or twenty-seven occurrences being found in them. Nor is it confined absolutely to the things of grace. Paul speaks also of the "mystery of lawlessness" (2 Thess. ii. 7). The redemption accomplished through Christ—this is the secret hidden for ages in the Divine Counsel and now revealed. This also is the truth, the disclosure of which to our understandings meant so large a gift of grace in the way of insight and spiritual discernment.—**κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν αὐτοῦ**: *according to His good pleasure.* This is to be attached neither to the **μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ**, which needs no further definition, nor to the following **προέθετο, κ.τ.λ.**, but to the **γνωρίσας**, precisely as the previous **προορίσας** was declared to be **κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ** (ver. 5). The opening of this secret to us after the silence of ages had its ground and reason in nothing else than the gracious counsel or free purpose of God.—**ἣν προέθετο**: *which He purposed.* This verb **προτίθεμαι** occurs only thrice in the NT, and all three instances are in the Pauline Epistles: once of human purpose (Rom. i. 13), once of the Divine action (Rom. iii. 25), and once (here) of the Divine purpose. The *eternal* purpose of God is in view, as the context shows. The **προ** in the compound verb, however, does not express the idea of the *pre-temporal*. It appears to have the local sense—*setting before oneself* and so *determining*.

αὐτῷ 10. [p] εἰς[1] [q] οἰκονομίαν τοῦ [r] πληρώματος τῶν [s] καιρῶν, [t] ἀνα- p=Matt. x. 18, q=Ch. iii. only; see ch. iii. 2; Col. i. 25; Luke xvi. 2 reff. r=Gal. iv. 4 only. s See Mark i. 15; Luke xxi. 24 reff. t Rom. xiii. 9 only †.
κεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ χριστῷ,[2] τὰ[3] ἐπὶ[4] τοῖς οὐρανοῖς

[1] For εις, κατα την A. [2] Omit τω 116, 143; Χρ. Ιησ. 143.

[3] Insert τε, a few cursives, Epiph., Cyr., etc.

[4] εν τοις ℵ[3]AFGKP, etc., Copt., Chr., Thdrt., Epiph., Thl., Ir.; text ℵ*BDEL, Goth., Eus., Thdrt., Dam., Oec., Tert., etc.

—**ἐν αὐτῷ**: *in Himself*. Some make it "in him," that is, in *Christ* (Chrys., Luth., Bengel, Hofm., Light., Wycl., Vulg., etc.), and this would be quite in accordance with the subsequent statement of the eternal purpose as one which God "purposed in Christ Jesus the Lord" (Eph. iii. 11). But God and His will are the subjects in view here, and the mention of *Christ* seems too remote for the **αὐτῷ** to refer naturally to Him. The purpose is God's own free determination, originating in His own gracious mind. The reading **ἐν αὑτῷ** is adopted by Mey., Ell., etc., while **ἐν αὐτῷ** is given by Lachm., Tisch., WH, Harl., etc. The question whether the NT knows any other form than **ἑαυτοῦ** as the reflexive of the third person is still debated. It is urged (*e.g.*, by Bleek, Buttm., etc.) that the NT does not use **αὐτοῦ**, but only **ἑαυτοῦ** in most cases or at least the vast majority, on such grounds as these, *viz.*, that the MSS. have **ἀπό, ἐπί, ὑπό**, etc., and not **ἀφ', ἐφ', ὑφ'**, before **αὐτοῦ**; that in the second person we find only **σεαυτοῦ**, not **σαυτοῦ**; and that the first and second personal pronouns are often used in the NT instead of the reflexive, though not when the pronoun is immediately dependent on the verb. Lightfoot concludes that "**αὐτοῦ**, etc., may be used for **ἑαυτοῦ**, etc., in almost every connection, except where it is the direct object of the verb" (see his note on Col. i. 20). On the other hand, Ell. is of opinion that the reflexive form is in place "where the attention is principally directed to the subject," and the non-reflexive where it is "diverted by the importance of the details". Winer, while admitting that in most passages **αὐτοῦ**, etc., would suffice, would write **αὑτοῦ**, etc., certainly in a few cases such as John ix. 21 (**αὐτὸς περὶ αὑτοῦ λαλήσει**) and Rom. iii. 25 (**ὃν προέθετο ὁ Θεὸς . . . εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ**), and would prefer it also in such passages as Mark vii. 35; Luke xii. 34, xix. 15; Rom. xiv. 14; Rev. xi. 7, xiii. 2; as also here in Eph. i. 9. See Buttm., p. 111; Win.-Moult., p. 188; Bleek, *Heb.*, ii., p. 69.

Ver. 10. **εἰς οἰκονομίαν**: *unto a dispensation*. This expresses the *end* which God had in view in that which He purposed. Some (Erasm., Calv., etc.) give **εἰς** the *temporal* sense of *usque ad*. But the idea is rather the more definite one of *design*. God had His reason for the long delay in the revelation of the "mystery". That reason lay in the fact that the world was not ripe for the dispensation of grace which formed the contents of the mystery. In classical Greek the word **οἰκονομία** had the two meanings of (*a*) *administration*, the management of a house or of property, and (*b*) the *office* of administrator or steward. It was used of such things as the arrangement of the parts of a building (Vitruv., i., 2), the disposition of the parts of a speech (Quint., *Inst.*, iii., 3), and more particularly of the financial administration of a city (Arist., *Pol.*, iii. 14; *cf.* Light., *Notes, sub voc.*). It has the same twofold sense in the NT—an *arrangement* or *administration* of things (in the passages in the present Epistle and in 1 Tim. i. 4), and the *office* of administrator—in particular the stewardship with which Paul was entrusted by God (1 Cor. ix. 17; Col. i. 25). The idea at the basis of the statement here, therefore, as also in the somewhat analogous passage in Gal. iv. 1-11, is that of a great household of which God is the Master and which has a certain system of management wisely ordered by Him. *Cf.* the figure of the Church as the household of God (1 Tim. iii. 15; Heb. iii. 2-6; 1 Pet. iv. 17), and the parables which run in terms of God as **οἰκοδεσπότης** (Matt. xiii. 27, xx. 1, 11, xxi. 33; Luke xiii. 25, xiv. 21).—**τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν**: *of the fulness of the times*. That is, a dispensation *belonging to* the fulness of the times. The gen. cannot be the *gen. objecti* (Storr, etc.), nor the *epexegetic* gen. (Harl.), but must be that of characteristic quality, "a dispensation *proper to* the fulness of the times" (Mey.), or it may express the *relation of time*, as in **ἡμέρα**

ὀργῆς (Rom. ii. 5), **κρίσις μεγάλης ἡμέρας** (Jude 6). In Gal. iv. 4 the phrase takes the more general form **τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου**; here it has the more specific form **τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν καιρῶν**, the fulness of the *seasons*, or series of appointed, determinate times. The idea of the *fitness* of the times, it is probable, is also expressed by the **καιρῶν** as distinguished from **χρόνων**, the former being a qualitative term, the latter a quantitative (see Light., *Notes*, p. 70). *Cf.* Heb. i. 1, and especially the **πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρός** of Mark i. 15. In classical Greek **πλήρωμα** appears to have both the passive sense, "that which is filled," and the active, "that which fills". The former is rare, the latter is sufficiently common. See Lidd. and Scott, *Lex.*, and Rost u. Palm., *Worth.*, *sub voce*. In the NT likewise it seems to have both senses (though this is questioned); the passive being found in the great doctrinal passages in the Pauline Epistles (Eph. iii. 19, iv. 13, etc.), the active occurring more frequently and in a variety of applications (Matt. ix. 16; Mark ii. 21, vi. 43, viii. 20; Rom. xi. 12; 1 Cor. x. 26). With reference to *time* it means "complement"—the particular time that completes a long prior period or a previous series of seasons. The purport of the statement, therefore, appears to be this: God has His household, the kingdom of heaven, with its special disposition of affairs, its **οἰκονόμος** or steward (who is Christ), its own proper method of administration, and its gifts and privileges intended for its members. But these gifts and privileges could not be dispensed in their fulness while those for whom they were meant were under age (Gal. iv. 1-3) and unprepared for them. A period of waiting had to elapse, and when the process of training was finished and the time of maturity was reached the gifts could be bestowed in their completeness. God, the Master of the House, had this fit time in view as the hidden purpose of His grace. When that time came He disclosed His secret in the incarnation of Christ and introduced the new disposition of things which explained His former dealings with men and the long delay in the revelation of the complete purpose of His grace. So the Fathers came to speak of the incarnation as the **οἰκονομία** (Just., *Dial.*, 45, 120; Iren., i., 10; Orig., *C. Cels.*, ii., 9, etc.). This "œconomy of the fulness of the seasons," therefore, is that stewardship of the Divine grace which was to be the trust of Christ, in other words, the dispensation of the Gospel, and that dispensation as fulfilling itself in the whole period from the first advent of Christ to the second. In this last respect the present passage differs from that in Gal. iv. 4. In the latter "the fulness of the time" appears to refer definitely to the mission of Christ into the world and His work there. Here the context (especially the idea expressed by the next clause) extends the reference to the final completion of the work—and the close of the dispensation at the Second Coming.—**ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι**: *to sum up*. Or, having regard to the Middle Voice, "to sum up for Himself". The sentence thus introduced is one of the select class of passages which refer to the cosmical relations of Christ's Person or Work. It is one of great doctrinal importance. Its exact import, however, is very differently understood by different interpreters. Every word in it requires attention. There is *first* the question of its precise relation to the paragraph of which it forms part. The inf. is taken by most (Mey., Ell., etc.) to be the *epexegetic* inf., conveying something complementary to, or explanatory of, the preceding statement, and so = "namely (or to wit), to sum up". It is that inf., however, in the particular aspect of *consequence* or *contemplated result* = "so as to sum up" (so Light.; *cf.* Win.-Moult., pp. 399, 400). But with what part of the paragraph is this complementary sentence immediately connected? The doctrinal significance of the sentence depends to a considerable extent on the answer to the question, and the answer takes different forms. Some understand the thing which is explained or complemented to be the whole idea contained in the statement from **γνωρίσας** onwards, 'at once the content of the **μυστήριον**, the object of the **εὐδοκία**, and the object reserved for the **οἰκ.**" (Abb.). Others limit it to the **μυστήριον** (Bez., Harl., Kl.), or to the **προέθετο** (Flatt, Hofm.). Others understand it to refer to the **εὐδοκίαν** in particular, the **ἣν . . . καιρῶν** clause being regarded as a parenthesis (Alf., Haupt); and others regard it as unfolding the meaning of the immediately preceding clause—the **οἰκονομίαν τ. π. τ. κ.** (Mey., etc.). The last seems to be the simplest view, the others involving more or less remoteness of the explanatory sentence from the sentence to be explained. So the point would be that the *œconomy*, the new order of things which God in the purpose of His grace had in view for the fulness of the seasons, was one which had for

its end or object a certain *summing up* of all things. But in what sense is this *summing up* to be understood? The precise meaning of this rare word **ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι** has to be looked at. In the classics it is used of *repeating summarily* the points of a speech, gathering its argument together in a summary form. So Quintilian explains the noun **ἀνακεφαλαίωσις** as *rerum repetitio et congregatio* (vi., 1), and Aristotle speaks of the **ἔργον ῥητορικῆς** as being **ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι πρὸς ἀνάμνησιν** (*Frag.*, 123). In late Greek the verb means also to present in *compendious form* or to *reproduce* (*Protev. Jac.*, 13). The simple verb **κεφαλαιοῦν** in the classics denotes in like manner to *state summarily*, or *bring under heads* (Thuc., iii., 67, vi., 91, etc.), and the noun **κεφάλαιον** is used in the sense of the *chief point* (Plato, *Laws*, 643 D), the *sum of the matter* (Pind., *P.*, 4, 206), a *head* or *topic* in argument (Dionys. Hal., *De Rhet.*, x., 5), a *recapitulation* of an argument (Plato, *Tim.*, 26, etc.). In the NT the verb **ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι** occurs only twice, namely here and in Rom. xiii. 9; in which latter passage it is used of the *summing up* of the various commandments in the one requirement of love to one's neighbour. The simple verb **κεφαλαιοῦν** occurs only once, *viz.*, in Mark xii. 4, where it has the sense of *wounding in the head;* but the text is uncertain there, TTrWH reading **ἐκεφαλίωσαν** with BℵL, etc. The noun **κεφάλαιον** is found twice, *viz.*, in Acts xxii. 28, where it has the sense of a *sum of money* (as in Lev. vi. 5; Num. v. 7, xxxi. 26), and in Heb. viii. 1, where it means the *chief point* in the things that the writer has been saying. The prevailing idea conveyed by these terms, therefore, appears to be that of a logical, rhetorical, or arithmetical summing up. The subsequent specification of the objects of the **ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι,** however, makes it plain that what is in view here is not a logical or rhetorical, but a real or objective summing up. Further, as the verb comes not from **κεφαλή** but from **κεφάλαιον,** it does not refer to the summing up of things under a *head,* and the point of view, therefore, is not that of the *Headship* of Christ—which comes to distinct expression at the close of the chapter. On the other hand it does not seem necessary to limit the sense of the word (with Haupt) to the idea of a *résumé* or *compendious presentation* of things in a single person. The question remains as to the force of the prep. in the compound verb. The **ἀνα** is taken by many to add the idea of *again,* and to make the result or end in view the bringing things back to a unity which had once existed but had been lost. So it is understood by the Pesh., the Vulg., Tertull. (*e.g.*, in his *Adv. Marc.*, v., 17, "affirmat omnia ad initium recolligi in Christo"; in the *De Monog.*, 5, "adeo in Christo omnia revocantur ad initium," etc.), Mey., Alf., Abb., etc. On the other hand, Chrys. makes the compound verb equivalent to **συνάψαι**; and the idea of a return to a former condition is negatived by many, the **ἀνα** being taken to have simply the sense which it has in **ἀναγινώσκειν, ἀνακρίνειν, ἀνακυκᾶν, ἀναλογίζεσθαι, ἀναμάνθανειν,** etc., and to express the idea of "*going over* the separate elements for the purpose of uniting them" (Light., *Notes*, p. 322). Usage on the whole is on the side of the latter view, and accordingly the conclusion is drawn by some that this "summing up" is not the recovery of a broken pristine unity, but the gathering together of objects now apart and unrelated into a final, perfect unity. Nevertheless it may be said that the verb, if it does not itself definitely express the idea of the restoration of a lost unity, gets that idea from the context. For the whole statement, of which the **ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι** clause forms part, runs in terms of a *redemption,* and the cognate passage in Col. i. 20 speaks of a final *reconciliation* of all things.—**τὰ πάντα**: *all things.* An all-inclusive phrase, equivalent to the totality of creation; not *things* only, nor yet *men* or intelligent beings only (although the phrase might bear that sense, *cf.* Gal. iii. 22), but, as the context shows, all created objects, men and things. *Cf.* the universal expression in Col. i. 20.—**ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ**: *in Christ,* or rather "in the Christ," the introduction of the article indicating that the term has its official sense here. The same is clearly the case in ver. 12, and, as Alford notices, the article does not seem to be attached to the term **Χριστός** after a prep. unless some special point is in view. The point of union in this gathering together of all things is the Christ of God. In Him they are to be unified.—**τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς**: *the things in the heavens, and the things upon the earth.* Or, according to the better reading and as in RV marg., *the things upon the heavens, and the things upon the earth.* The reading of the TR, though supported by AGK, most cursives, Chrys., etc.,

u Hereonly. καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ γῆς· II. ἐν αὐτῷ, ἐν ᾧ καὶ u ἐκληρώθημεν[1] v προορισθέντες
1 Kings xiv. 41. w κατὰ x πρόθεσιν[2] τοῦ τὰ[3] πάντα y ἐνεργοῦντος κατὰ τὴν z βουλὴν
v Acts iv. 28; Rom. viii. 29, 30; 1 Cor. ii. 7; ver. 5 only †. w = Phil. ii. 3 reff. x = Rom. viii. 28, ix. 11; ch. iii. 11; 2 Tim. i. 9; Acts xxvii. 13; 2 Macc. iii. 8. y 1 Cor. xii. 6, 11; Phil. ii. 13.
z = Acts ii. 23, iv. 28, xiii. 36; Heb. vi. 17.

[1] For **εκληρ., εκληθημεν** (*gloss*) ADEFG, it., d, e, g; text B ℵ KLP, al., d, e, f, g, Vlg., Euseb., Euthal., Cyr., Chrys., Thdt., Dam., etc.

[2] Before **προθ.** insert **την** D[1]FG, al. After **προθ.** insert **του Θεου** DEFG 10, 46, 71-3, 80, Copt., Eth., Slav., Ambrst.

[3] Before **παντα** om. **τα** D[1]FG 109, Thdrt.

must give place to **τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς**, which is adopted by LTTrWH on the basis of B ℵ DL, etc. It is an unusual form for the compound phrase, the term **ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς** being ordinarily coupled with **ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς** (*cf.* iii. 15; also the parallel in Col. i. 20, where the **ἐπί** is poorly attested). The **ἐπί** in **ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς**, however, may have the force of *at*, which it has in such phrases as **ἐπὶ πύλῃσιν** (*Il.*, iii., 149), **ἐπὶ πύργῳ** (*Il.*, vi., 431), **ἐπὶ τῇ προβατικῇ** (Acts iii. 10, 11), the heavens being regarded, as Meyer thinks, as "the stations at which the things concerned are to be found". The phrase in its two contrasted parts defines the preceding **τὰ πάντα**, making the all-inclusive nature of its universality clear by naming its great divisions. It is not to be understood as referring in its first section to any particular class, *spirits in heaven, departed saints of Old Testament times, angels* (as even Chrys. and Calv. thought), *Jews*, and in its second section specifically to *men* or to *Gentiles*. It explains the universality expressed by **τὰ πάντα** as the widest possible and most comprehensive universality, including the sum total of created objects, wherever found, whether men or things.—**ἐν αὐτῷ**: *in him*. Emphatic resumption of the **ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ** and transition to the following statement, solemnly re-affirming also, as Ell. suggests, *where* the true point of unity designed by God, or the sphere of its manifestation, is to be found.

The passage has been supposed (Orig., Crell., etc.) to teach the doctrine of a Universal Restoration. But interpreted as above it has nothing to do with any such doctrine, whether in the sense of a final salvation of all unrighteous and unbelieving men or in that of a final recovery of all evil beings, devils and men alike. Nor, again, does it refer particularly to the case of the *individual*. It speaks, as Meyer notices, of the "aggregate of heavenly and earthly things," and of that as destined to make a true unity at last. Another view of the general import of the statement, which has been elaborated with much ability by Haupt, requires some notice. Pressing to its utmost the sense of a *résumé* or *summary*, which he regards as the idea essentially contained in the terms in question, he contends that the meaning of the statement is that in Christ, who belongs at once to humanity and to the heavenly world, should be seen the compendious presentation of all beings and things—that in His person should be summarised the totality of created objects, both earthly and heavenly, so that outside Him nothing should exist. He looks for the proper parallel to this not in Col. i. 20, but in Col. i. 16, 17, where it is said of Christ that "in Him were all things created" and that "in Him all things consist". And he appeals in support of his view to the use of the kindred verb **συγκεφαλαιοῦσθαι** in Xen. (*Cyr.*, viii., 1, 15, viii., 6, 14), where it expresses the organisation of a multitude of slaves under one representative, in whom they and their acts were so embodied that Cyrus could transact with all when dealing with the one. But the idea of Christ's agency in the first creation and the continuous maintenance of things is not expressed in the passage in Ephesians, and while it is the pre-existent Christ that is in view in Col. i. 16, here it is the risen Christ. It remains, therefore, that the present passage belongs to the same class as Rom. viii. 20-22; Col. i. 20, etc., and expresses the truth that Christ is to be the point of union and reconciliation for all things, so that the whole creation shall be finally restored by Him to its normal condition of harmony and unity.

Ver. 11. **ἐν ᾧ καὶ**: *in whom also we*. The **καί** does not qualify the *subjects* (for there is no emphatic **ἡμεῖς**, nor is there any such contrast between **ἡμεῖς** and **ὑμεῖς** here as appears in verses 12, 13),

but refers to what is expressed by the verb and presents that as something additional to what has been expressed by the preceding verb. The "we," therefore, designates Christians inclusively, and the **καί** gives the sentence this force —"not only was it the purpose of God to make known the secret of His grace to us Christians, but this purpose was also fulfilled in us in point of fact and we were made His own—not only chosen for His portion but actually made that". The AV "in whom also we" seems to follow the erroneous rendering of the Vulg., *in quo etiam nos*. Equally at fault are those (including even Wetstein and Harless) who limit the "we" to Jewish Christians here.—**ἐκληρώθημεν**: *were made a heritage*. The reading **ἐκλήθημεν**, found in a few uncials and favoured by Griesb., Lachm., Rück., may be a gloss from Rom. viii. 13, or possibly a simple case of mistaken transcription due to the faulty eyes of some scribe. The verb **ἐκληρώθημεν** is of disputed meaning here. This is its only occurrence in the NT. The compound form **προσκληροῦν** also occurs in the NT, but only once (Acts xvii. 4). In classical Greek **κληροῦν** means to *cast the lot*, to *choose by lot*, and to *allot*. Both in the classics and in the NT **κλῆρος** denotes a *lot*, and then a portion *allotted*. The cognate **κληρονομεῖν** means to *get by lot*, to obtain an *allotted portion*, and so to *inherit*; and **κληρονομία**, in the LXX often representing נַחֲלָה, signifies a *property inherited*, or a *possession*. In the OT it is used technically of the portion assigned by lot to each tribe in the promised land, and of the Holy Land itself as Israel's possession given by God (Deut. iv. 38, xv. 4). In the NT it gets the higher sense of the blessedness of the Messianic kingdom, the Christian's destined possession in the consummation of the Kingdom of God. The affinities of **κληροῦν** show that it may have the definite sense of *heritage*. It is alleged indeed by some (*e.g.*, Abb.) that the only idea expressed in **κληροῦν** is that of assigning a *lot* or *portion*, and that the notion of an *inheritance* does not belong to it. But the portions of land assigned by lot to the tribes of Israel on their entrance into Canaan were secured inalienably, and the lots belonging to each family were so secured to the family from father to son that it was impious to let them go into the hands of strangers (*cf.* the case of Naboth, 1 Kings xxi. 3). Thus the idea of *lot* or *portion* passed over into that of *inheritance*. Thus, too, in the OT the blessings of the people of God, recognised to be possessed by God's free gift and not by the people's merit, came to be described in terms of a *heritage*, and God Himself, the Giver of all, was looked to as the supreme portion of His people, the possession that made their inheritance (Ps. xvi. 5-11). But in the OT there was also the counter idea that Israel was the portion or inheritance of the Lord, chosen by Himself to be His peculiar possession. At times these two ideas meet in one statement (Jer. x. 16). The question, therefore, is—which of these two conceptions is embodied in the **ἐκληρώθημεν** here? Or may it be that the word has a sense somewhat different from either? Some take this latter view, understanding the word to mean *appointed by lot*, or *elected by lot, sorte vocati sumus* as the Vulg. makes it. So Syr., Goth., Chrys., Erasm., Estius, etc. So also the Genevan Version gives "we are chosen," and the Rhemish "we are called by lot". The point thus would be again the sovereignty of the Divine choice, the Christians in view being described as appointed to their Christian position *as if* by lot. But when our *appointment* or *election* is spoken of it is nowhere else said to be by *lot*, but by the purpose or counsel of God. Retaining, therefore, the general conception of an *inheritance*, some take the passive **ἐκληρώθημεν** for the middle, and render it simply "we have obtained an inheritance" (AV., Conyb.). The passive, however, must be accepted as a real passive, and the choice comes to be between these two interpretations: (*a*) *we were made partakers of the inheritance, in hereditatem adsciti, enfeoffed* in it (Eadie), and (*b*) *we were made a heritage* (RV), God's **λαὸς ἔγκληρος**, taken by Him as His own peculiar portion. The former is the view of Harl., Mey., Haupt, etc., and so far also of Tyndale and Cranmer, who translate "we are made heirs". It deals with the pass. **κληροῦσθαι** on the analogy of such passives as **πιστεύομαι, φθονοῦμαι, διακονοῦμαι**; it has the advantage of being in accordance with the idea regularly conveyed by the cognate terms **κληρονομία, κληρονομεῖν**; and it points to a third gift of God of the same order with the previous two—forgiveness, wisdom, inheritance. The other interpretation, however — "made a heritage," "taken for God's inheritance"—is to be preferred (with Grot., Olsh., De Wette, Stier., Alf., etc.) as being on the whole more consistent with usage; more in

a Acts iii. 19, vii. 19; Rom. i. 11, 20 al. τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, 12. [a]εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς εἰς [b]ἔπαινον δόξης[1] αὐτοῦ[2] τοὺς [c]προηλπικότας [d]ἐν τῷ χριστῷ[3]· 13. ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς,[4]

b Ver. 6 reffs. c Here only. d 1 Cor. xv. 19; Ps. xxxii. 21.

[1] της δοξ. A, al., Chr., Thdrt., Oec.; text ℵBDEFGKLP 1, 35, 48, 57, all Eus. Cyr., Dam., Thl.

[2] After δοξ. omit αυτου D[1]FG, d, e, g, Tert.

[3] τους to χρ. om. 115; τω om. FG 1, 59.

[4] For υμεις, ημεις ℵ[3]AKL 13, 39, 44-6, all Thl., Oec.

harmony with the import of the other passives in the paragraph; sustained, perhaps, by the use of προσκληροῦν in Acts xvii. 4, where the idea is rather that of *being allotted* to Paul as disciples than that of joining their lot (AV and RV = "consorted with") with Paul; and, in particular, as suggested by the εἰς τὸ εἶναι that follows—εἰς τὸ ἔχειν rather than εἰς τὸ εἶναι being what would naturally follow the statement of an inheritance which we received.—προορισθέντες κατὰ πρόθεσιν: *having been foreordained according to the purpose.* The fact that we were made the heritage of God is thus declared to have been no incidental thing, not an event belonging only to time or one having its explanation in ourselves, but a change in our life founded on and resulting from the eternal foreordaining purpose of God Himself. The *purpose* of God is expressed here by the term πρόθεσις, the radical idea in which is that of the setting of a thing before one. It occurs six times in the Pauline Epistles, and is not confined to one class of these, but appears alike in the Primary Epistles, the Epistles of the Captivity, and the Pastoral Epistles (Rom. viii. 28, ix. 11; Eph. i. 11, iii. 11; 2 Tim. i. 9, iii. 10). Outside these Epistles it occurs only twice in the NT, both times in Acts (xi. 23, xxvii. 13) and of human purpose.—τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐνεργοῦντος: *of Him who worketh all things.* The πάντα has the absolute sense, and is not to be restricted to the "all things" that belong to the Divine grace and redemption. The foreordination of men to a special relation to God is connected with the foreordination of things universally. The God of the chosen is the God of the universe; the purpose which is the ground of our being made God's heritage is the purpose that embraces the whole plan of the world; and our position as the κλῆρος and possession of God has behind it both the sovereignty and the efficiency of the Will that *energises* or is operative in all things.—κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ: *after the counsel of his will.* The distinction between βουλή and θέλημα is still much debated, scholars continuing to take precisely opposite views of it. On the one hand, there are those who hold that θέλειν and its cognates express the will as proceeding from *inclination*, and that βούλεσθαι and its cognates express the will as proceeding from *deliberation* (Grimm, Wilke, Light., etc.). On the other hand, there are those who contend that θέλειν is the form that conveys the idea of *deliberation* and βούλεσθαι that which carries with it the idea of inclination. In many passages it is difficult, if not impossible, to substantiate any real distinction, the terms being often used indiscriminately. But in connections like the present it is natural to look for a distinction, and in such cases the idea of *intelligence* and *deliberation* seems to attach to the βουλή. This appears to be supported by the usage which prevails in point of fact in the majority of NT passages, and in particular by such occurrences as Matt. i. 19. Here, therefore, the will of God which acts in His foreordaining purpose or decree, in being declared to have its βουλή or "counsel," is set forth as acting not *arbitrarily*, but *intelligently* and by deliberation, not without reason, but for reasons, hidden it may be from us, yet proper to the Highest Mind and Most Perfect Moral Nature. "They err," says Hooker, with reference to this passage, "who think that of God's will there is no reason except His will" (*Ecc. Pol.*, i., 2). It is also implied in this statement that the Divine foreordination, whether of things universally or of men's lots in particular, is neither a thing of necessity on the one hand nor of caprice on the other, but a thing of freedom and of thought; and further, that the reasons for that foreordination do not lie in the objects themselves, but are intrinsic to the Divine Mind and the free determination of the Divine Will.

Ver. 12. **εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς εἰς ἔπαινον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ**: *to the end that we should be unto the praise of His glory.* The art. **τῆς** is inserted by the TR before **δόξης,** but on slender authority. It is omitted by most of the primary uncials and other important documents. On the other hand, the **αὐτοῦ** after **δόξης** is omitted by a few ancient authorities, especially D^1F. This clause states the ultimate end which God had in view in foreordaining us to be made His **κλῆρος.** It was not for our own privilege (as the Jews with their limited and exclusive ideas had misinterpreted the object of God in His election of them), but that through us His glory might be set forth. *Cf.* the prophetic declaration, "the people which I formed for myself, that they might set forth my praise" (Isa. xliii. 21); and such passages as Ps. cxliv. 12; Sirach xxxix. 10; Phil. i. 11; 1 Pet. i. 7. The sentence is best connected with the principal verb, not with the **προορισθέντες** which defines the **ἐκληρώθημεν,** but with the **ἐκληρώθημεν** itself. It is also to be taken as a whole, containing one idea, precisely as is the case with the other **εἰς ἔπαινον** sentences in vv. 6, 14. To break up the clause so as to take the **εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς** to express the *end* or *object*, further defined by the **τοὺς προηλπικότας,** and to make **εἰς ἔπαινον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ** an incidental or parenthetical clause, is in the highest degree artificial and out of harmony with the other sentences. The question remains as to the persons included in the **ἡμᾶς** —whether Christians generally, or Jews or Jewish Christians specially. In order to answer that question the force of the following clause must be determined.—**τοὺς προηλπικότας ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ**: *we who had* (RV marg., "have") *before trusted in Christ.* Better, *we, to wit, who have aforetime hoped in the Christ.* The article defining the **προηλπικότας** is most naturally taken as placing the **προηλπικότας** in *apposition* to the **ἡμᾶς** and as explaining the **ἡμᾶς** now in view to be a particular class, and not the subjects of God's grace generally. The attempt is made, indeed, in more than one way (*e.g.*, by Hofm., Harl., Abb., Haupt, etc.) to construe **τοὺς προηλπικότας** as the predicate, so that the sense should be, "to the end that we should be those who have before hoped (or believed) in Christ". But this is not a construction naturally suggested by the simple form of the sentence. It has also the disadvantage of not being in harmony with what is the prevalent, though not invariable, use of the article as distinguishing subject from predicate, and it turns the **εἰς ἔπαινον κ.τ.λ.** awkwardly into a parenthetical sentence—"to the end that we, to the praise of His glory, should be those who have before hoped in Christ". It is to be further noticed that the **προ** in **προηλπικότας** must have its proper force, expressing a hope cherished before the event. Some understand this differently, taking the **προ** to express the fact that Jewish Christians *preceded* Gentile Christians in hoping in Christ (Beza, Grot., Beng., etc.). Others (De Wette, etc.) would make the event in view as the object of hope the *second* Advent of Christ, the *Parousia* of the Epistles. But the point appears to be that there were those, namely, pious Jews of OT times, who cherished a hope in the Christ of promise and prophecy before the appearance of Christ in history. The words are entirely appropriate as a description of those who looked for Christ before He came. The prep. **ἐν** is most naturally understood as is the **ἐν** after the simple **ἐλπίζειν,** *e.g.*, in 1 Cor. xv. 19, and the **ἐλπίζειν** itself must have the natural sense of *hoping*, not *believing* or *trusting.* Yet, again, the object of the hope is here not **Χριστὸς,** but **ὁ Χριστός,** "*the* Christ," "the Messiah". The sense consequently is, "we, to wit, who have reposed our hope in the Christ before He appeared". These things help us to answer the question—Who are the persons referred to? They are, say some, *Christians generally*, as those who hope in the Christ who is to return, and of whom it may be said, speaking of them from the standpoint of the final fulfilment at Christ's second Advent, that they are those who have reposed their hope in the Christ who is to come. This is urged specially on the ground that, as all through the preceding paragraph Paul has spoken of things pertaining to Christians generally and has used the terms "we," "us" of Christians without distinction, it is unreasonable to suppose that at this point he changes all and puts a restricted meaning on the **ἡμᾶς.** On this view the following **ὑμεῖς** must also be taken not as referring to a distinct class of Christians, but simply as applying to the Ephesian readers in particular what is said of all Christians as such. It must be allowed that much may be said in favour of this view. But on the other hand it is just at this point that Paul introduces a **ὑμεῖς** as well as a **ἡμᾶς**—a fact that naturally suggests a distinction between two classes; as in chap. ii.

e 2 Cor. vi. 7; 2 Tim. ii. 15; James i. 18. f=2 Cor. i. 22; ch. iv. 30; see Rev. vii. 3 al. g Here only; see Rom. i. 4, viii. 15; xi. 8; 2 Cor. iv. 13; 2 Tim. i. 7; Heb. x. 29.

ἀκούσαντες τὸν [e]λόγον τῆς [e]ἀληθείας, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς [1] σωτηρίας ὑμῶν,[2] ἐν[3] ᾧ καὶ πιστεύσαντες [f]ἐσφραγίσθητε[4] τῷ [g]πνεύματι τῆς

[1] της om. FG. [2] ημων K 74, 115, 122, Copt., etc.
[3] εν ω και om. Ambrst.; om. και DEFG, d, e, g, Copt., Goth., Arm., etc.
[4] εσφραγισθη B; -ημεν Did.

11-22 he draws out the distinction definitely and with a purpose between two classes who became believers in the Christ in different ways and at different times. Hence it appears simplest (with Mey., etc.) to regard Paul as speaking in this clause specially of those who like himself had once been Jews, who had the Messianic prophecies and looked for the Messiah, and by God's grace had been led to see that in Christ they had found the Messiah. In the following **ὑμεῖς,** therefore, he refers to those who had once been Gentiles and had come to be believers in Christ. This is supported by the explanatory nature of the clause introduced by **τούς,** by the proper sense of the **προηλπικότας,** and by the introduction of **τῷ Χριστῷ** in place of **Χριστῷ.**

Ver. 13. **ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς**: *in whom ye also.* The reading **ἡμεῖς** appears in certain manuscripts of importance (AKL𝔎[3] *e, f, g,* etc.); but the weight of documentary authority is greatly on the side of **ὑμεῖς.** Taking, therefore, the **καὶ ὑμεῖς,** as contrasted with the previous **ἡμᾶς,** to refer to the readers of the Epistle as *Gentiles* in distinction from the writer and those whom he couples with himself as having formerly been *Jews*, we have in this verse and the following a paragraph which gives first a description of the evangelical standing and experience of Gentile Christians such as these Ephesians were, and then a statement of the fact that, in their case as in that of the others, God's ultimate end in His gracious dealing with them was the praise of His glory. The opening clause, however, presents some difficulty. The sentence is left with something unexpressed, or its form is disturbed. How is it to be construed? It is natural to think first of explaining it by supplying some verb for the **ὑμεῖς,** and as the substantive verb is often left to be understood, some introduce **ἐστέ** here = "in whom ye also are," "in whom ye also have a part" (Mey., Alf.). But the great Pauline formula **ἐν Χριστῷ εἶναι** can scarcely be dealt with thus, the **εἶναι** in it has too profound a sense to allow of its being dropped and left to be understood as is possible with the ordinary substantive verb. Others, therefore, look to the immediately preceding **προηλπικότας** for the word that is to be supplied (Erasm. Calv., Beza, Est., etc.; and so AV "in whom ye also *trusted*"). But to make this applicable to Gentile believers requires us (unless the Second Advent is supposed to be the object of the hope) to supply only **ἠλπίκατε** not **προηλπίκατε,** and to give the verb the modified sense of *trusting* or *believing*. Much more may be said in favour of supplying the definite verb **ἐκληρώθημεν** which rules the larger sentence (Erasm. in his *Paraphrase*, Cornel. a Lap., Harl., Olsh., etc.) = "in whom ye also were made God's **κλῆρος,** or possession". The comparative distance of the **ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς** from **ἐκληρώθητε** is no serious objection, especially in view of the fact that it is the definite verb, and not a qualifying participle, that is in view. There remains, however, yet another method of explanation, *viz.*, to regard the sentence as an interrupted construction, in which the expression of the main thought, that of the **ἐσφραγίσθητε,** is delayed by other preliminary ideas, the second **ἐν ᾧ** being a *resumption* and continuation of the first (Theod. Mops., Jer., Beng., De Wette, Rück., Bleek, Bisp., Ell., Humphrey, Abb., Von Sod., Haupt). This solution of the difficulty appears on the whole to be the best, and it has been preferred by the majority of interpreters. It seems to be favoured by the Syr., Copt. and Eth. Versions, and is adopted by the RV—"in whom ye also, having heard the word of the truth, the gospel of your salvation —in whom, having also believed, ye were sealed". The interruption of the regular construction in the statement of the fact of their having been "sealed" appears to be caused by the introduction of the idea of the primary Christian requirement of *faith* after the mention of the *hearing*. It is objected that the distance between the one **ἐν ᾧ** and the other is much less than is usual in such cases, and that in a

resumption we should expect not **ἐν ᾧ καί**, but **ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς**. But *anacoloutha* are quite in Paul's way, and they are not all of one type or one extension (*cf.* Win.-Moul., p. 704), and the **καί** (*minus* the **ὑμεῖς**) is appropriate as giving an ascensive force to the **πιστεύσαντες**. This view of the construction has the advantage also of enabling us to retain substantially the same sense for the **ἐν ᾧ** in these three occurrences (vv. 11, 13), and it makes the defining participles **ἀκούσαντες** (with its clause) and **πιστεύσαντες** important preparations for the statement of privilege in the **ἐσφραγίσθητε**, each contributing something proper in its own place to the order of ideas. Hence both the first **ἐν ᾧ** and the second are to be connected with the **ἐσφραγίσθητε** = "in whom, on hearing and believing, ye were sealed"; it being *in Christ*, in virtue of our union with Him, that we receive the gift of the Spirit.—**ἀκούσαντες**: *having heard* (or, *on hearing*). This comes in its proper order, the *first* in the series of things, preparing the way for the sealing of the Spirit. In the narratives of cases of reception into the Christian Church in the Book of Acts we discover this order of grace: hearing, repentance, baptism, the gift of the Holy Ghost (ii. 37, 38), or hearing, faith, baptism, the gift of the Holy Ghost (viii. 6, 12, 17). Yet this is not an invariable order. Sometimes only hearing, baptism, and the gift of the Holy Ghost (xix. 5, 6) are mentioned; and in such instances as those of Paul (ix. 17) and the men of Cæsarea (x. 44-47), the gift of the Holy Ghost appears to have preceded the administration of baptism. On the importance of *hearing*, that is, access to the preached word, *cf.* Rom. x. 13-17, where the **πιστεύειν** is declared to come by the **ἀκούειν**.—**τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας**: *the word of the truth*. The **λόγος** here is evidently the word of preaching, and it is said to be "of the truth," not with any particular reference, as Meyer justly observes, to the OT word as one that dealt with types and shadows rather than realities (Chrys.), or to the word of heathenism as the word of error (Corn. a Lap., etc.), but in the sense in which our Lord Himself spoke of the *truth* and the *word* (John xvii. 17; *cf.* Col. i. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 15; James ii. 17). The gen. is not that of apposition (Harl.), but the *gen. objecti*, "the word concerning the truth;" or, as Ell. suggests, the gen. of ethical *substance* or ethical *content*, "the word of which the truth is the very essence, or content".—**τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς σωτηρίας ὑμῶν**: *the gospel of your salvation*. Further definition of "the word of the truth". The preached word which has the truth for its essential content is that which brought you the good tidings of salvation. Here, again, the gen. is not that of *appos.* or *identity* (Harl., etc.), but most probably that of *content* or *subject matter* (Mey., Ell., etc.). Elsewhere we have the **εὐαγγέλιον** defined as that of *the Kingdom* (Matt. ix. 35), of *God* (Rom. i. 1), of *the Kingdom of God* (Mark i. 14), of *Christ, Jesus Christ, His Son*, etc. (Rom. i. 1, 9, 16; Mark i. 1), of *peace* (Eph. vi. 15), of *the grace of God* (Acts xx. 24), of *the glory of the blessed God* (1 Tim. i. 11), of *the glory of Christ* (2 Cor. iv. 4). Nowhere in the NT is the word **εὐαγγέλιον** used so frequently and in such a variety of applications as in the Pauline Epistles. It is never used in Luke's Gospel, in John's Gospel or Epistles, in Hebrews, or in James; in Matthew's Gospel it occurs four times, in Mark eight times, in Acts twice, in Peter once, and in the Apocalypse once. The noun **σωτηρία**, which has so large a place in the rest of the Pauline writings, is of rare occurrence in these Epistles of the Captivity. It is found thrice in the Epistle to the Philippians, but only once in this profound Epistle to the Ephesians (in vi. 17 we have the other form **τὸ σωτήριον**), and not even once in the sister Epistle to the Colossians.—**ἐν ᾧ**: —*in whom, I say*. With the former **ἐν ᾧ** the writer turned from the case of those like himself who, having been Jews, had been made God's **κλῆρος** in Christ, to that of Gentiles like these Ephesians who also had been made partakers of God's grace in Christ, though in a different way, not as having had the hope of the Jews in a promised Messiah, but simply as having heard the word of Christian preaching. The particular gift of grace which it was in his mind to state as bestowed on these Gentile Christians was the sealing of the Spirit. With this second **ἐν ᾧ**, "—in whom, I say," he takes up the statement which had been interrupted by the mention of the way in which they had come to receive the grace, and brings it (with a further reference to the antecedents to the sealing) to its intended conclusion. This **ἐν ᾧ**, therefore, is not to be dealt with differently from the former and made to relate to the **εὐαγγέλιον**, as if = "in which Gospel having also believed, ye were sealed" (Mey.). It simply continues the idea of the previous **ἐν ᾧ**, expressing the fact that the grace which came to the Gentile who heard the word of preaching,

h Constr. Mark xv. 16; Gal. iii. 16; ch. iii. 13, vi. 17; Phil. i. 28 al. fr. i 2 Cor. i. 22, v. 5 only; Gen. xxxviii. 17, 18, 20. k=Acts xx. 32; Col. iii. 24; 1 Pet. i. 4. l Ver. 7 reff. m 1 Thess. v. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 14; Heb. x. 39; 1 Pet. ii. 9 from Mal. iii. 17; 2 Chron. xiv. 13. n Ver. 6 reff.

[h] **ἐπαγγελίας τῷ ἁγίῳ,** 14. [g] **ὅς** [1] **ἐστιν** [i] **ἀρραβὼν** [2] **τῆς** [k] **κληρονομίας ἡμῶν εἰς** [l] **ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς** [m] **περιποιήσεως, εἰς** [n] **ἔπαινον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ.**

[1] For **ος, ο** (*gramm. emendn.*) ABFGLP 57, 67^2, 71, all, Ath., Euthal., Chr.; text ℵDEK, most MSS., d, Chr.-comm., Thdrt., Did., Thl., Oec.

[2] **αραβων** FG 37, 76, Euthal., etc.

like the grace which came to the Jew who had the Messianic hope, was bestowed "in Christ," and had its ground in Him.—**καὶ πιστεύσαντες**: *having also believed.* The **καί** belongs not to an implied **ὑμεῖς** but to the **πιστεύσαντες.** It is the *ascensive* **καί,** adding to the first condition of *hearing* the second and higher of *believing.* The object of the **πιστεύσαντες** is the previous **λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας,** "having also believed that word of preaching;" not the **ᾧ,** "believing also in whom" (Calv., Bez., Mey.). In Biblical Greek the phrase **πιστεύειν ἔν τινι** is of very rare occurrence, especially in the sense of believing or confiding in a *person* (Ps. lxxviii. 22; Jer. xii. 6). In Mark i. 1 it has **τὸ εὐαγγέλιον** as the object. In John iii. 15 both the reading and the connection are uncertain; in John xvi. 30 the idea is "by this". The **πιστεύσαντες** here expresses something prior to the fact conveyed by the definite verb, not contemporaneous with it (Harl.). The sealing was *in Christ* (**ἐν ᾧ**), and it followed on their **πίστις.—ἐσφραγίσθητε**: *ye were sealed.* The verb **σφραγίζειν** (= חָתַם) in the NT expresses several distinct ideas, *e.g.*, *confirming* or *authenticating* (John iii. 32, vi. 27; *cf.* **σφραγίς** in Rom. iv. 11; 1 Cor. ix. 2); *securing* (Matt. xxvii. 66; Rev. xx. 3); *keeping secret* (Rev. x. 4, xxii. 10; *cf.* **σφραγίς** in Rev. v. 1, 2, 5, 9, vi. 1, viii. 1, etc.); *marking* as one's possession or as destined for something (Rev. viii. 3-8; *cf.* **σφραγίς** in 2 Tim. iii. 4; Rev. ix. 4). Here and in iv. 30 the idea seems to be either that of *authenticating* or *certifying* them to be of God's heritage, or that of *marking* them as such. The two ideas are near akin. The latter will be more applicable, if (with Theophyl., Chrys., Cornel. a Lap., Alf., etc.) we take the attestation to be the objective attestation to others, the evidence to our fellows that we are the chosen of God; the former, if (with Mey., Ell., etc.) we take it to be the attestation to our own consciousness. This hope or assurance which is given to ourselves seems rather in view here (*cf.* Rom. viii. 16). There is no reason to suppose that there is any allusion here to any peculiar use of the seal whether in Jewish custom or in heathen religious service. Nor is the rite of Baptism specially referred to. In ecclesiastical Greek, indeed, baptism came to be denoted by the term **σφραγίς**; but there is no instance of that in the NT. The terms **σφραγίς, σφραγίζειν,** are used in the Pauline Epistles of *circumcision* (Rom. iv. 11), of the *contribution* from Macedonia and Achaia (Rom. xv. 28), of the Corinthians as the *witnesses* to Paul's apostleship (1 Cor. ix. 2), of the inward *certification* of believers (2 Cor. i. 22; Eph. i. 13, iv. 30), and of the *destination* or *ownership* of the Church or congregation of believers (2 Tim. ii. 19).—**τῷ Πνεύματι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῷ ἁγίῳ**: *with the Holy Spirit of promise.* The Spirit is that by which (*instrumental* dative) the sealing is effected; and that Spirit is called the Spirit *of promise*, not in the active sense of *bringing* or *confirming* the promise (Calv., Bez., etc.), but in the passive sense of having been announced by the promise, or being the *object* or *content* of the promise in the OT. The **τῷ ἁγίῳ,** thrown emphatically to the end of the clause, designates the Spirit solemnly in respect of the essential personal quality of holiness. Taken together with the general tenor of the paragraph and with the fact that in the **ὑμεῖς** Gentile Christians as a whole are addressed, and not any select number or class, it is clear that what is in view here is not the extraordinary or miraculous gifts of the Spirit, but that bestowal of the Spirit in which all believers shared, which was the subject of the great OT prophecies (Joel iii. 1-5; Isa. xxxii. 15, xliv. 3; Ezek. xxxvi. 26, xxxix. 29; Zech. xii. 10), and of which a new heart, a new spirit, was to be the result.

Ver. 14. **ὅς ἐστιν ἀρραβὼν τῆς κληρονομίας ἡμῶν**: *which is an earnest of our*

inheritance. So with the RV, rather than "who is the earnest," etc., of the AV. The reading ὅ is preferred by Lachm., Alf., WH, etc., as supported by ABGL, Athan., Cyr., Chrys., etc. The TR is the reading of ℵDK, Thdrt., Damasc., Theophyl., etc.; the masc. form ὅς being due to attraction to the following **ἀρραβών,** as, *e.g.*, in **τῷ σπέρματί σου ὅς ἐστι Χριστός,** Gal. iii. 16. The word **ἀρραβών** (or **ἀραβών,** the form preferred by Tisch. and regarded by WH as only Western, *cf.* Westcott and Hort's *New Testament in Greek*, II., App., p. 148) is the LXX reproduction of the Heb. עֵרָבוֹן which occurs in Gen. xxxviii. 17, 18, 20 and is rendered "pledge". It is found in classical Greek of earlier date than the LXX (*e.g.*, Isaeus, *De Cir. her.*, 23; Aristotle, *Pol.*, i., 11; Menander, *Frag. Com.* (Meineke), iv., pp. 268, 283; etc., *cf.* Light., *Notes, ut sup.*, p. 323), and is supposed, therefore, to have come from the Phœnicians into Greek use. At an early date it was introduced also into Latin, but by what channel we know not. In Latin it occurs in the three forms *-arrabo, rabo* (*e.g.*, in Plautus, *Truc.*, iii., 20), and *arra* (*e.g.*, Aul. Gell., xvii., 2). It survives in the forms *arra, arrhes* in the languages most directly derived from the Latin; as also in our *arles*, the obsolete English *earlespenny*, etc. Etymologically, it appears to have expressed the idea of *exchange*, and so its primary sense may have been that of a "pledge" simply. But it came to mean more than **ἐνέχυρον,** or *pledge*, in the sense of something exchanged between two parties to a contract or agreement. Its proper sense is that of *earnest*—part of the price to be received or part of the thing that is to be possessed, given in assurance that the full payment or the complete possession will follow. Wycl. gives "ernes"; the Rhemish, "pledge"; Tynd., Cran., and the Genevan, "earnest". The idea is similar to that elsewhere expressed by **ἀπαρχή,** "first-fruits" (Rom. viii. 23). The "earnest of the Spirit" is mentioned by itself in 2 Cor. v. 5; in 1 Cor. i. 22, as here, it is introduced along with the *sealing* of the Spirit. To the truth expressed by the latter it adds the higher idea that the believer possesses already in reality, though but in part, the lifeof the future; the inheritance of the present and the inheritance of the future differing not in kind but only in degree, so that even now we have the life and blessedness of the future in the way of foretaste. It is doubtful whether the term is also meant to suggest the idea of *obligation* on the believer's side, as Light. thinks, who takes it to intimate that "the Spirit has, as it were, a lien upon us".—**εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν**: *unto the redemption.* The "unto" of the RV is to be preferred to the "until" of the AV. The clause is to be connected not with the **ὅς ἐστιν ἀρραβών, κ.τ.λ.,** but with the main statement, *viz.*, the **ἐσφραγίσθητε,** and the **εἰς** expresses not the idea of *time* but that of *purpose.* It is the first of two purposes which God is here declared to have had in *sealing* them. In that operation of His grace God had it in view to make them certain of the complete redemption which was to come at the consummation of the Kingdom of God. The **ἀπολύτρωσις** here, as the tenor of the passage plainly indicates, is the final, perfected redemption, as in iv. 30, Rom. viii. 23, and probably 1 Cor. i. 30.—**τῆς περιποιήσεως**: *of the possession.* The "*purchased* possession" of the AV is less apt, as the verb **περιποιεῖσθαι** expresses the general idea of *preserving, acquiring, gaining for oneself*, without specific reference to a *price.* But what is the import of the phrase here? The form of the noun **περιποίησις** and its use point to the active sense, *preserving, acquiring.* In 2 Chron. xiv. 13 it is said of the Ethiopians that they fell **ὥστε μὴ εἶναι ἐν αὐτοῖς περιποίησιν,** so "that they could not recover themselves" (RV text), or, "so that none remained alive" (RV marg.). The word occurs in the NT five times in all (Eph. i. 14; 1 Thess. v. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 14; Heb. x. 39; 1 Pet. ii. 9). In three of these instances it certainly has the active sense (1 Thess. v. 9, **περιπ. σωτηρίας**; 2 Thess. ii. 14, **περιπ. δόξης**; Heb. x. 39, **περιπ. ψυχῆς**), and it would be most natural to take it in that sense here. But it is difficult to adjust that to the genitive case dependent on the **ἀπολύτρωσιν.** The most plausible rendering on that view is that proposed by Abbott, *viz.*, "a complete redemption which *will give possession*". The noun may be taken, however, in the passive sense, and a more natural meaning results. Some then understand it of the inheritance we are to possess. So Aug. and Calv. make it = *haereditas acquisita;* Matthies, "the promised glorious possession"; Bleek, "the redemption which is to become our possession". So, too, Macpherson takes the "possession" to be the "inheritance of the saints" here, as he takes the previous **ἐκληρώθημεν** to mean "made possessors of our lot". But all

o constr., Matt. xi. 2; Acts. xxiii. 16; Gal. i. 13; Col. i. 4; Philem. ver. 5. p constr., Acts xvii. 28, xviii. 15, xxvi. 3; *πίστ. ἐν*, Gal. iii. 26; Col. i. 4; 1 Tim. iii. 13; 2 Tim. iii. 15; Paul only. q Rom. v. 8; Col. i. 4; 1 Pet. iv. 8. =*ἀγ ἐν*, 1 John iv. 16. r=ver. i. reff.

15. **Διὰ τοῦτο κἀγὼ**, °**ἀκούσας τὴν** ᵖ**καθ' ὑμᾶς** ᵖ**πίστιν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ** ’**Ιησοῦ**[1] **καὶ τὴν** ᑫ**ἀγάπην τὴν**[2] ᑫ**εἰς πάντας τοὺς** ʳ**ἁγίους**, 16. **οὐ**

[1] Insert **Χριστω** DEFG, d, e, g, Goth., Syr.-P., Eth., Victorin.

[2] **αγαπην την** om. (*homœotel.*) ℵAB 17, al., Cyr., Jer., Aug.: **την** om. D¹FG also.

becomes plainer if we understand the idea to be rather that of God's possession in us, the **περιποίησις** being taken as the equivalent of the OT סְגֻלָּה, סְגֻלָּה מִכָּל־הָעַמִּים, by which Israel is designated as the possession acquired by the Lord for Himself (Exod. xix. 5; *cf.* Deut. vii. 6, xiv. 2, xxvi. 18; Ps. cxxxv. 4). It is true that the LXX rendering of סְגֻלָּה is usually **περιούσιος**. But that is not the only form that is adopted. In Ps. cxxxv. 4 the phrase is **εἰς περιουσιασμὸν ἑαυτῷ**; and in Mal. iii. 17, where Aquila has **περιούσιος**, the LXX has **εἰς περιποίησιν**. Further, in Isa. xliii. 21 the same idea is expressed by the corresponding verb—**λαόν μου ὃν περιεποιησάμην** (*cf.* Acts xx. 28, **τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἣν περιεποιήσατο**). So, too, Peter, with this passage in view, describes the spiritual Israel of the NT as **λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν** (1 Pet. ii. 9); while in Titus, ii. 14, again, we have **λαὸν περιούσιον**. This interpretation is that of the Syriac, Erasm., Calvin, etc., and it is preferred by most recent commentators, including Harless, Meyer, Ell., Alf., etc. It is adopted also by the RV, which renders it "*God's* own possession". Wycliffe, however, gives "purchasynge"; the Genevan, "that we might be *fully* restored to liberty"; the Rhemish, "the redemption of acquisition"; the AV, Tyndall and Cranmer give "the purchased possession".—**εἰς ἔπαινον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ**: *unto the praise of his glory*. The second end of the *sealing*, or rather the second aspect of the ultimate purpose of God in the sealing. The final end on our side of that great act of grace is the consummation of the redemption of those who have been made God's own people. On God's side the final end of the same grace is "the praise of His glory"—the adoring confession of the glories of the Divine Nature and Mind so revealed to men. The **αὐτοῦ** refers to the main subject here, not Christ *in* whom we obtain the grace, but God *by* whom it is willed—the Eternal Origin of all.

Vv. 15-23. Second Section of the Epistle: in which the writer expresses his own feelings and desires towards the Ephesians, and in doing so leads them to the highest conception both of Christ's own supremacy and of the grandeur of that Church of His of which they had been made members. The wonders of the grace thus shown them give him occasion, he tells them, for increasing thanksgiving. But his thanksgiving also prompts him to prayer on their behalf. Seeing to what they had already attained in the Christian life into which that marvellous grace had brought them, especially in faith and in brotherly love, his prayer is that they may increase in these yet more and more, and in particular that they may have an enlarging insight into the hope that springs from their calling, the inheritance which is reserved for them, and the present power of Christ which is the guarantee for all that they have and look for.

Ver. 15. **Διὰ τοῦτο κἀγώ**: *For this cause I too*. **διὰ τοῦτο** might cover the contents of the entire preceding paragraph, pointing back to ver. 3 and indicating that in his thanksgiving to God, in behalf of these Ephesians, the Apostle had in his mind the whole counsel and eternal choice of God of which he first made mention, and the whole operation of grace in the lives of the Ephesians in the several particulars afterwards instanced. In view, however, of the transition from the more general "us" to the more definite "ye also" in ver. 13 it is probably more accordant with the tenor of thought to take the **διὰ τοῦτο** to refer to the signal manifestation of God's grace in the sealing of these believers, who had been taken from the dark pagan world, with the Spirit which was both assurance and foretaste of an inheritance undreamt of in their heathenism. The **κἀγώ** is best explained by the same **καὶ ὑμεῖς**. It means simply "I on my side," and does not imply as some, including, even Meyer, suppose, that the writer was thinking of a co-operation be-

tween those addressed and himself in thanksgiving and prayer.—**ἀκούσας τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν ἐν τῷ Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ**: *having heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus.* It has been wrongly inferred from the **ἀκούσας** that the writer had no personal acquaintance with those addressed and knew of their conversion only by the report of others. Philemon was well known to Paul, who spake of him indeed as his **ἀγαπητός**, his **συνεργός**, and his son in the faith (ver. 19). Yet Paul uses with reference to him almost the same terms as those used here—**εὐχαριστῶ . . . μνείαν σου ποιούμενος . . . ἀκούων σου τὴν ἀγάπην καὶ τὴν πίστιν κ.τ.λ.** (ver. 4, 5). Besides, what the writer speaks of here is not their conversion but their faith and love, and it is only in harmony with all that we know of Paul that he should have used every opportunity of keeping himself in communication with them and watching their progress. Through Tychicus, or some other visitor or messenger, tidings of their Christian walk may have come to him now (*cf.* Introduction). In any case he finds his first and foremost reason for thanksgiving in the report of the way in which the fundamental Christian requirement was made good among them —that of *faith*, their faith in the Lord Jesus Himself. The phrase here is not the usual **τὴν ὑμετέραν πίστιν**, or **τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν**, but **τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν.** The sense, however, is substantially the same. Some good grammarians indeed seek to establish a distinction between the two phrases, and claim a special partitive or distributive sense for the one with **κατά.** Ellicott, *e.g.*, points to the fact that the form **ἡ καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστις** is adopted only once by Paul, while **πίστις ὑμῶν** occurs some seventeen times in his Epistles, and concludes on the whole that the former may denote "the faith of the community viewed objectively," "*the faith which is among you*," whereas the latter expresses "the subjective faith of individuals". Alford, also, gives the former the sense of the "faith which prevails among you" (on the analogy of **τῷ κατ' αὐτοὺς βίῳ** in Thuc., vi., 16), and takes it to imply that some in the Ephesian Church may not have had the faith. So the RV gives in its text "the faith . . . which is among you"; marg., "*in* you". But the analogies referred to (*e.g.*, **τῷ νόμῳ τῷ ὑμετέρῳ**, John viii. 17, as contrasted with **νόμου τοῦ καθ' ὑμᾶς** in Acts xviii. 15; *cf.* Ell.) scarcely bear this out, and there is much to show that the latter form had become, or was on the way to become, simply a periphrasis for the former. Such phrases as **ὡς καί τινες τῶν καθ' ὑμᾶς ποιητῶν**; the above **νόμου τοῦ καθ' ὑμᾶς**; and **τῶν κατὰ Ἰουδαίους ἐθῶν** (Acts xvii. 28, xviii. 15, xxvi. 3) may be thus explained; and in later Greek **κατά** with an acc. is frequently used where the older classical Greek would have had the gen. case, *e.g.*, **ἡ κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπόθεσις** = *the resignation of government*, Diod., S., i., 65. So, while in the NT **κατά** may usually retain its distributive force, in cases where it is followed by the acc. of a personal pronoun it may mean nothing more than the poss. adj. or the gen. of the personal pronoun. As Buttmann points out, strictly speaking it is not so much that "the case was periphrased but that the prepositional phrase *displaced* the simple case"; as it was easy for the Greek language to make prepositional phrases *dependent immediately* upon substantives, and natural, therefore, for it in its later developments to carry this further and employ "prepositional expressions even where the earlier language still preferred the simple case" (*Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 156; *cf.* Bernhardy's *Syntax*, p. 241; Win.-Moult., pp. 199, 241, 499; Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 133).—**καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους**: *and your love toward all the saints.* The reading is uncertain. The Received Text inserts **τὴν ἀγάπην**, which has the support of such authorities as א[3]DGKL, Syr., Boh., Lat., Copt., Goth., Thdrt., etc., and is adopted by Tisch. and Tregelles (the latter bracketing it in margin). It is regarded by WH as a Western and Syrian insertion from Col. i. 4. The **τὴν ἀγάπην** is omitted by א[1]BAP, 17, Orig., Cyr., Jer., etc., and is deleted by Lach., WH and RV. The documentary evidence is on the side of the omission. But the difficulty is to find in that case a suitable sense. Hort thinks that Philem. 5 furnishes a parallel, as it might be rendered (with RV marg.) "hearing of thy love and faith which thou hast toward the Lord Jesus and toward all the saints". But the *love* is expressed there. Dale would render it "having heard of the faith in the Lord Jesus Christ which is among you and shown toward all the saints," as if the point of the latter clause was the *reality* or *manifestation* of the faith. But in the Greek there is nothing corresponding to the "shown". The **πίστις**, in short, if it belongs to both clauses, must be introduced in two different aspects, as *belief* in the first clause and as *faithfulness* in the second. But in the absence of any

s=Acts vi. 13 al.; Col. i. 9; Isa. xxxviii. 20. t=John xi. 41; Rom. i. 8 al. fr. Paul only. u Rom. i. 9; Phil. i. 3; 1 Thess. i. 2, iii. 6; 2 Tim. i. 3; Philem. 4. v=Rom. i. 10; 1 Thess. i. 2; Philem. 4 only. w Rom. xv. 6; 2 Cor. i. 3, xi. 31; 1 Pet. i. 3 only; abs., here only. x=2 Cor. i. 3; James i. 17. y Acts vii. 2. z Exod. xxviii. 3; see 2 Tim. i. 7. a=ch. iii. 3.

[s] παύομαι [1] [t] εὐχαριστῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν [u] μνείαν ὑμῶν [2] ποιούμενος [v] ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου, 17. ἵνα ὁ [w] θεὸς [w] τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν [y] Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, ὁ [x] πατὴρ τῆς [y] δόξης, δῴη [3] ὑμῖν [z] πνεῦμα [z] σοφίας καὶ [a] ἀποκαλύ-

[1] παυσομαι DE, Victorin.

[2] Omit υμων ℵABD 17, 33-5-7-9, 73, 116-8, all, d, e, Goth., Hil.; text D[3]EKLP, vg., Syr.[utr.], Cop., Arm., Orig., Chrys., Thdrt., etc.

[3] δω B, 63, Cyr.

intimation of a double presentation of πίστις this is awkward exceedingly. The Revisers nevertheless render it—"the faith in the Lord Jesus which is among you, and which *ye shew* toward all the saints". The insertion in any case is of early date, and the omission may have been due to the eye of some ancient scribe being deceived by the two occurrences of τήν. The grace in question, whether their love or their faithfulness, was of catholic quality, taking *all* the saints for its objects.

Ver. 16. **οὐ παύομαι εὐχαριστῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν**: *cease not to give thanks for you.* The **παύομαι** is most naturally connected with the nearer participle. There is no reason why the remoter participle should be made the leading term, as some construe it, rendering it so—"I cease not, while giving thanks for you, to make mention," etc. (Abbott). The verb **εὐχαριστεῖν**, which is used in later Greek both in the sense of *feeling thankful* and in that of *giving thanks*, occurs in none of the NT Epistles except in that bearing Paul's name. In these it is found some twenty-six times. It also appears once in Revelation, twice in Acts, and more frequently in the Gospels.—**μνείαν ὑμῶν ποιούμενος**: *making mention of you.* Documentary evidence is against the insertion of **ὑμῶν**. Though it is supported by considerable authorities (D[3]K LP, Vulg., Syr., Boh., Orig., etc.), it has no place in ℵBAD[1], etc., and is omitted by LTTrWH and the Revisers. The subject of the **μνεία**, therefore, must be understood. It may be **ὑμῶν**, or it may rather be the preceding **πίστιν** and **ἀγάπην**. In the phrase **μνείαν ποιεῖσθαι** the noun seems to have the sense of *mention*. In other connections it has the sense of *mindfulness* (**μνείαν ἔχειν τινός**, 1 Thess. iii. 6) or that of *remembrance* (Phil. i. 3).—**ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου**: *in my prayers.* On **ἐπί** as here = *in* see Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 137; Win.-Moult., p. 470; Bernh., *Synt.*, p. 246. The *local* reference proper to **ἐπί** (as the preposition answering the question Where?), however, is not wholly sunk in the *temporal* sense. See Ell. on 1 Thess. i. 2. Winer takes it to express the idea of something *attaching* itself to something else. The word for prayer used here is one of frequent occurrence in the NT, sometimes joined with **δέησις** (*e.g.*, Eph. vi. 18; Phil. iv. 6, etc.), and sometimes with **ἔντευξις** as well (1 Tim. ii. 1). The most general term is **προσευχή** = *precatio*, and that term is not used but of prayer to *God*. **Δέησις**, which can be used also of addresses to men, has the more definite sense of *petitio, rogatio;* while **ἔντευξις**, which means a *falling in with, conference, conversation*, and goes beyond the idea of *intercession* (as our AV renders it), expresses prayer as the converse of the soul with God, with the notion of urgency and filial confidence. See Huther and Ell. on 1 Tim. ii. 1; Win.-Moult., *sub* **δέησις**; Light. on Phil. iv. 6; Trench, *Syn., sub voce.*

Ver. 17. **ἵνα ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ**: *that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ.* In the parallel passage in Col. i. 9 the **ἵνα** is preceded immediately by **αἰτούμενοι**, and has the reduced or sub-telic force which it has after verbs of asking, expressing the content of the prayer, but that in the light of *purport*. Here the **ἵνα** relates to the general idea of the sentence, instead of being immediately dependent on any verb for *asking*. It has more of the idea of *purpose*, therefore, in it. It is to be admitted, however, that in NT Greek the proper *telic* sense of **ἵνα** is seen in the process of *weakening* and passing over into the force of **ἵνα** as the sign of the inf. in modern Greek. Yet, even when expressing simple *result* or *event*, it has behind it the Hebrew idea of events as the results of Divine purpose;

cf. Blass, *Gram. of N.T. Greek*, pp. 224, 225; Buttm., *Gram. of N.T. Greek*, pp. 236-241; Ell. on Phil. i. 9. It is most usual for Paul to speak of God as the *Father* of our Lord Jesus Christ or as His *God and Father*. Here he speaks simply of "the God of our Lord Jesus Christ". The designation, though misunderstood and misapplied by the Arians and their successors in modern times, is entirely consistent with Christ's own words (Matt. xxvii. 46; John xx. 17) and with the highest view of His Person. In the Eternal Godhead the Son has His life from the Father, the One Fount of Deity, and is subordinate in the sense in which *son* is subordinate to *father*, while He has the same Divine being. In the ministry of redemption our Lord, while the Son of the Eternal Father, is the Christ of God, God being revealed in Him, *sending* Him (Gal. iv. 4), *exalting* Him (Phil. ii. 9), receiving back the kingdom from Him (1 Cor. xv. 24). In respect of His mission, His mediation, His official work and relations, He has God as *His* God, whose commission He bears and whose redeeming purpose He is to fulfil.—**ὁ πατὴρ τῆς δόξης**: *the Father of glory*. This is not to be taken in the reduced sense of "the glorious Father". On the other hand it is not to be dealt with as if the **δόξα** referred to Christ's *divinity*, as in the exigencies of the controversy with Arian views some were driven to interpret it, arguing that the one phrase, "the God of our Lord Jesus Christ," applied to His human nature and the other, "the Father of the glory," to His divine nature (Athan., Greg. Naz.). Nor yet, again, is **δόξα** to be regarded as referring to Christ's glorified humanity (Stier). Taking the **δόξης** in its proper sense and with the full force of the gen. case, some give the **πατήρ** the sense of *author* or *maker*, understanding God to be designated as the Source of glory (Erasm., Grot., Olsh., etc.). For this some appeal to such instances as Job xxxvii. 28; Jas. i. 17. But that is at the best a rare sense of **πατήρ** and one otherwise unknown to Paul. More is to be said in favour of the idea that the gen. designates God as the Father who *gives* glory, the glory bestowed on Christ Himself (*cf.* Acts iii. 13) no less than that reserved for Christians. It is best, however, to take it as the gen. of *characteristic quality*—the Father to whom glory belongs (Mey., Ell., etc.); *cf.* the same designation in Ps. xxix. 3; Acts vii. 2; also "the King of glory," Ps. xxiv. 7; "the Lord of glory," 1 Cor. ii. 8; "the cherubims of glory," Heb. ix. 5, etc. The appropriateness of the title here lies in the preceding definition of the final end of God's counsel and grace—**εἰς ἔπαινον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ.—δῴη ὑμῖν**: *may give unto you*. Lachm., Fritzsche (*Rom.*, iii., 230) and Haupt (who refers to the confirmation furnished recently by two inscriptions of the second century given in Dittenb., *Syll.*, 462_{17}, 466_{9}) give the Ionic conj. **δώῃ**; WH give **δώῃ** *vel* **δῷ** in the margin, but **δῴη** in the text. The latter form is to be preferred, although opinion is still divided to some extent on the conj. and opt. forms. Blass, *e.g.*, takes the **δώῃ** in the present passage to be really a conj. and to be best represented by the **δῷ** of Cod. B. He is inclined to regard the forms **δοῖ, δῴη** as both conj. and opt. (*Gram. of N.T. Greek*, pp. 49, 211). As in the NT **ἵνα** in the vast majority of cases is followed by the conj. or the fut. indic. even after past tenses, it would be most natural to accept the conj. form here. But this Ionic form of the conj. appears to be strange to the NT and to be "without analogies in later Greek" (Butt., *Gram. of N.T. Greek*, p. 46). On the other hand, the form **δῴη** seems to be recognised as a later Greek equivalent to **δοίη**, and Winer accepts it as an opt. pres. in NT Greek, pointing to such passages as Rom. xv. 5; 2 Tim i. 16, 18 (ii. 7); John xv. 16, as well as Eph. i. 17, iii. 16, and the comp. **ἀποδῴη** of 2 Tim. iv. 14 (Win.-Moult, *Gram.*, p. 94.—**πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως**: *the Spirit of wisdom and revelation*. The question here is whether the **πνεῦμα** is to be understood in the subjective sense of our *spirit*, or in the objective sense of the Holy Spirit. The former view is adopted by Chrys., Thdrt., Rückert, De Wette, Bleek, and more recently by Abbott and the Revisers, the RV rendering being "a spirit of wisdom and revelation". This is urged on the analogy of such occurrences as Rom. viii. 15, xi. 8; Gal. vi. 1; 2 Tim. i. 7. But there is much against this. As Meyer points out, it is doubtful whether in the NT there is any case in which, when the **πνεῦμα** is spoken of as *given*, it is not the *objective* **πνεῦμα**. But apart from this, the matter in view is what the Ephesians were themselves to be, not what they were to do for others, and although it is easy enough to suit the subjective view of the **πνεῦμα σοφίας** ("a wise spirit") to this, the difficulty is to adjust to this the subjective view of the **πνεῦμα ἀποκάλυψεως**. The fatal objection, indeed, to the interpretation

b=Col. i. 9. ψεως [b] ἐν [c] ἐπιγνώσει [d] αὐτοῦ, 18. [e] πεφωτισμένους τοὺς [f] ὀφθαλμοὺς
c=ch. iv. 13; Col. i. τῆς [f] καρδίας ὑμῶν,[1] [g] εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς[2] τίς ἐστιν ἡ [h] ἐλπὶς τῆς 9, 10, ii. 2;
1 Tim. ii. 4 al.; Heb. x. 26; 2 Pet. i. 2, 3, 8, ii. 20; Paul and 2 Pet. only. d obj.-gen. aft. ἐπ. always. e=ch. iii. 9; Heb. vi. 4; see x. 32; Ps. xviii. 8. f Here only; see Matt. xiii. 15.
g Ver. 12 reff. h Ch. iv. 4 only; constr., see Col. i. 23.

[1] τ. οφθ. τ. διανοιας υμ. (*explany. corrn.*), with MSS., Cyr.-Jer., Thdrt., Oec.; text ℵABDEFGKLP, most curs., Goth., Syr., Cop., vg., Arm., etc. υμων om. B 17. etc.
[2] ινα οιδατε FG.

in question lies in the sense of the **ἀποκάλυψις**, which has the stated meaning not of *understanding* mysteries but of *disclosing* them; and the tenor of the paragraph makes it impossible to suppose that in the one case, that of the **σοφία**, Paul had in view a gift that was to make themselves wise, and in the other, the **ἀποκάλυψις**, a gift that was to render them capable of disclosing mysteries to others. How difficult it is to give **ἀποκάλυψις** its proper sense on the subjective view appears from the renderings proposed, *e.g.*, De Wette's, Rückert's, or Abbott's. The first makes it = "the quality of mind which consists in wisdom (mediate knowledge) and revelation (susceptibility for the immediate knowledge of divine truth)"; the second takes it as = "a wise heart and open for His revelation"; the third gives "a spirit of wisdom," but leaves the rest unattempted. But **ἀποκάλυψις** is not a *susceptibility* for knowledge, nor a *mind open* to revelation, nor anything like that. It is necessary, therefore, to take **πνεῦμα** as = the *Holy Spirit*, with Mey., Ell., Haupt. and most. The fact that the phrase is **πνεῦμα** and not **τὸ πνεῦμα** is no objection to that. The attempts made by Middleton, Harless, and others to make out an established distinction between the two forms, the one referring regularly to the personal Spirit of God and the other to the indwelling influence of the Spirit or the spirit of the believers as ruled by the Holy Spirit, cannot be regarded as successful; the terms **πνεῦμα, πνεῦμα ἅγιον, πνεῦμα Θεοῦ** being free to drop the article as proper names or terms of understood meaning. But what is the particular idea then in each of the two words **σοφία** and **ἀποκάλυψις**? It cannot be that the latter refers specifically to the **χάρισμα** of prophecy (so Olsh., etc.). For that is presented as a gift bestowed only on *some*, whereas the prayer here contemplates gifts for *all* those addressed, and there is nothing to indicate that a gift for the time being only is in view. Nor can it well be that the second noun expresses the means by which the gift intimated by the first noun was to take effect,—the gift of revelation bringing about the gift of wisdom (Harl.); for we should expect the order in that case to be reversed. The distinction between the terms is rather that of the gift of spiritual understanding generally and the gift of special revelations in particular, *cf.* 1 Cor. ii. 10; and so far the second is the higher idea. What Paul prays for on behalf of these Ephesian converts is that God might continue to bestow upon them the gift of His Holy Spirit already imparted to them, and that to the effect both of making them wise to understand the things of His grace and of disclosing to them more of the mysteries of His kingdom.—**ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ**: *in the knowledge of him.* The **αὐτοῦ** refers to *God*, as the context shows, not to *Christ*. The term **ἐπίγνωσις** occurs with special frequency in the Epistles of the Captivity and in 2 Peter with reference to the knowledge of *God* or of *Christ*, as in the Pastoral Epistles and Hebrews it is used of the knowledge of the *truth*. It *means* a knowledge that is true, accurate, thorough, and so might be rendered "full knowledge," notwithstanding the fact that the simple **γνῶσις** may be used at times in much the same sense (as possibly in 1 Cor. xii. 8, xiii. 8). The use of **γινώσκω** and **ἐπιγινώσκω** in 1 Cor. xiii. 12 points to the intensive sense of the compound form. The **ἐν** is not to be dealt with as = **εἰς** (Grot.) or **διά** (Beza), but must have either the *instrumental* sense or the *local*. It was by the knowledge of God Himself, or, as it may be better put, *within* the sphere of that knowledge that the gift of enlightenment and the reception of further disclosures of the Divine Counsel were to make themselves good. The only gifts desired for these converts were gifts of a spiritual order, meaning a better acquaintance with God Himself. The clause **ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ** is connected by some (Chrys., Lachm., Olsh., etc.) with the sentence which *follows*, and by

others only with the **ἀποκαλύψεως**. But the course of thought and the balance of the terms point to it as qualifying the two gifts specified in the preceding sentence.

Ver. 18. **πεφωτισμένους τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν**: *the eyes of your understanding* (heart) *being enlightened.* For the **διανοίας** of the TR, which is very poorly attested, **καρδίας** is to be read (with LTTrWHRV) on the authority of the best MSS., representing the different families (ℵBADFKL, etc.). The **ὑμῶν** is to be retained, though it is omitted by B 17, etc., and is bracketed by WH. The syntax of the sentence is difficult, but is best taken (with AV, Bez., Beng., Bleek, Mey., etc.) as an acc. absol. The existence, indeed, of the acc. absol. in the NT is still doubted by some good grammarians (Winer, Blass, etc.), and alleged cases are disposed of as *anacoloutha.* But such a construction, though of much rarer occurrence than the gen. absol., was not unknown to classical Greek (*cf.* Jelf, *Gr. Gram.*, ii., p. 406), even where there was no repetition of the subject (*cf.* Mey., *in loc.*), and there appear to be at least a few instances of it in the NT, *e.g.*, certainly in Acts xxvi. 3 (admitted by Buttm., *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 347), and probably in Rom. viii. 3, etc. The syntax is otherwise explained here (*e.g.*, by Harl., Stier, etc.) as a case of apposition, the **ὀφθαλμούς** continuing the **πνεῦμα**, as if = "that He may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation—enlightened eyes," an explanation in the highest degree awkward and next to impossible in view of the **τούς**. The presence of the article before **ὀφθαλμούς** and its absence before **πεφωτισμένους** point to a case of tertiary predicate (Buttm.), so that the sense would rather be "give unto you the Spirit—to wit, eyes enlightened". Others (Ell., etc.) account for it as an instance of lax construction and abnormal case (by no means rare in the NT), the **πεφωτισμένους** standing for **πεφωτισμένοις** and the **τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς** being the defining acc. = "that he may give unto you—being enlightened as to the eyes of your heart" (Ell., etc.). Only in biblical and ecclesiastical Greek is **φωτίζω** used of the inward enlightenment which means a *spiritual, saving* knowledge of the things of God; *cf.* **φωτισθέντες** as applied to those who had become Christians (Heb. vi. 4, x. 32), and the subsequent use of the same term to describe the "baptised" in early Christian literature. The unusual figure of speech, "the eyes of your heart," is peculiarly appropriate here. The gift in question is the special gift of *knowledge* or insight, hence the figure of the *eyes.* The knowledge is a *spiritual* knowledge; hence "the eyes of the *heart*," **καρδία** being the "inner man," the seat and centre of the mental and spiritual life, with special reference at times to the faculty of *intelligence* (Matt. xiii. 15; John xii. 40; Acts xxviii. 27; Rom. i. 21; 2 Cor. iv. 6; Heb. iv. 12, etc.).—**εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς**: *that ye may know.* The *object* of the enlightenment, *viz.*, *knowledge*, a fuller knowledge of certain things now specified.—**τίς ἐστιν ἡ ἐλπὶς τῆς κλήσεως αὐτοῦ**: *what is the hope of his calling.* The **τίς** is to be taken in its proper sense, not "how great" nor "of what kind," but "what"—what the hope really and essentially is. The **κλῆσις αὐτοῦ** is the call of which *God* is the author, and that is an effectual call. In the Gospels the **κλητοί** are contrasted with the **ἐκλεκτοί**, the "chosen" being the select few of the "called" (Matt. xxii. 14). In the Epistles the "*called* of God" are always those to whom the *call* has come with effect, who have listened to it and been made believers. The **κλήσεως** is best taken as the gen. of efficient cause (Mey., Ell., etc.)—the hope *effected, wrought* by the call. Hence the **ἐλπίς** is not the *object* hoped for (a sense which it has occasionally in the NT, *e.g.*, Tit. ii. 13; Col. i. 5; probably also Gal. v. 5; Heb. vi. 18), but the attitude of mind, the subjective hope, the assured Christian expectation.—**καὶ τίς ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ**: [*and*] *what the riches of the glory of his inheritance.* The best critics (LTTrWHRV) omit the **καί** of the RV, the diplomatic evidence (ℵ¹BAD¹F 17, etc.) being decidedly against it, although it has the support of ℵ³D³KL as well as certain Versions and Fathers. It does not follow from this omission, however, that we have not three distinct things mentioned in the three clauses, or that the second and third, which refer to the *inheritance* and the *power*, are only co-ordinate with the first, specifying two things relating to the **ἐλπίς** (so Haupt). The **κληρονομία** is not the inheritance which God has in us (a sense which the word seems never to have in the NT), but the inheritance which God gives to us and which is the object of our hope. The **αὐτοῦ** is the gen. of *origin.* The magnificence of this inheritance, the perfected blessedness of the Consummation, is expressed by a series of terms setting it forth in respect of the glory belonging to it and the riches pertaining to that glory,

i Rom. xi. 29; Phil. iii. 14. k See ver. 7 reff. l Col. i. 27.

[h] κλήσεως [i] αὐτοῦ, καὶ τίς [1] ὁ [k] πλοῦτος τῆς [l] δόξης τῆς [m] κληρονομίας [m] αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς [n] ἁγίοις, 19. καὶ τί τὸ [o] ὑπερβάλλον [2] [p] μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ [q] εἰς ἡμᾶς [3] τοὺς πιστεύοντας [r] κατὰ τὴν [s] ἐνέργειαν

m Ver. 14 reff.; constr., here only. n Ver. 1 reff. o 2 Cor. iii. 10, ix. 14; ch. ii. 7, iii. 9 only; see Job xv. 11. p Here only; Exod. xv. 16. q=2 Cor. ix. 13; ch. iii. 2; see ἐφ', ch. ii. 7. r=Ver. 5; Col. i. 11. s Phil. iii. 21; ch. iii. 7, iv. 16; Col. i. 29, ii. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 9, 11; Paul only.

[1] και before τις om. ℵABDFG, 17, 59, Goth., Ambrst.; insert ℵ[3]D[3]EKLP, MSS. nearly vss., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., Ambrst. MS., Jer., al.

[2] υπερβ. om. FG; υπερμεγεθος 63. [3] εις υμας DFGP 17, 31-7, al.[3], Ambrst.

and these as qualities for the better knowledge of which a new illumination of the Spirit is desired. The **δόξης** and the **κληρονομίας** are genitives of *possession* or of *characteristic quality*.—**ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις**: *in the saints*. How is this to be connected? Many (Harl., Rück., Olsh., Alf., etc.) attach it immediately to **κληρονομίας** = "the inheritance given by God among the saints," or, as Alf. paraphrases it, "*His inheritance in*, whose example and fulness and embodying is in, *the saints*". This would have been a more reasonable interpretation if the **κληρονομίας** had been followed by **τῆς**; in the absence of the article it would suit better if the **κληρονομία** could be taken as meaning God's inheritance in us. It is best on the whole to regard the **ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις** as related to the idea of the clause as a whole and as expressing the sphere within which (**ἐν** = among) these riches of the glory of the inheritance are known and realised. The **κληρονομία** is the *future* inheritance, which is ours at present only in foretaste. The "saints" are the whole community of those set apart to God in Jesus Christ (*cf.* Acts xx. 32, xxvi. 18), and that community contemplated specially in its future completeness. This is the seat of the inheritance, or the circle within which alone it is to be found in its riches and glory.

Ver. 19. **καὶ τί τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ**: *and what the exceeding greatness of his power*. The **αὐτοῦ** refers again to *God*, and the *power* of God is introduced in respect of that surpassing greatness which belongs to it alone and which is the guarantee of the fulfilment of the Christian hope. The context and the subsequent mention of the resurrection and exaltation of Christ show that it is the *future* of believers that is still distinctively in view. So in these three clauses Paul leads the readers on from the hope itself which becomes theirs in virtue of their being called of God, to the splendour of the inheritance to which the hope points, and from this again to that in God Himself which makes the fulfilment of the hope and the possession of the inheritance certain, namely the limitless efficiency which is His prerogative.—**εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας**: *to us-ward who believe*. No better rendering of **εἰς ἡμᾶς** here could be devised than the "to us-ward" of the AV which is wisely retained by the RV. The clause is best attached to the whole thought of the preceding sentence, and not to the **δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ** alone. The **εἰς** expresses the idea of "ethical direction" (Ell.), indicating the objects toward whom this Divine power will go forth—those, namely, who are believers. The **ἡμᾶς** connects these Ephesian believers, in whom the Divine power has worked mightily even now (*cf.* the conjunction of *faith* and the *power of God* in 1 Cor. ii. 5), with that whole community of the saints which was mentioned in the former sentence as the circle within which at last the complete possession of the inheritance will be made good.—**κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ**: *according to the working of the strength of his might*. Another impressive accumulation of terms, further describing that boundless efficiency of God in which we have our security for the realisation of the hope however new, and the possession of the inheritance however rich in its glory. **Ἐνέργεια**, which in the NT is never used but of superhuman power whether Divine (Eph. iii. 7, iv. 16; Col. i. 29, ii. 12) or Satanic (2 Thess. ii. 9), denotes power as *efficiency*, *operative*, *energising* power. **Κράτος** is power as *force*, *mastery*, power as shown in *action*: **ἰσχύς** is power as *inherent*, power as possessed, but passive. The phrase, therefore, means "the efficiency of the active power which expresses inherent might". This again is best understood as defining the whole preceding statement, not as belonging simply to the **πιστεύοντας**. For, while the idea that our *faith* is the result of God's power, is clearly expressed elsewhere (*e.g.*, Col.

τοῦ [t] κράτους τῆς [t] ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ, 20. [u] ἣν [u] ἐνήργησεν[1] ἐν τῷ χριστῷ, [t] ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, [v] καὶ [w] ἐκάθισεν[2] [x] ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς [y] ἐπουρανίοις[3] 21. [x] ὑπεράνω πάσης [a] ἀρχῆς καὶ [b] ἐξουσίας[4] καὶ [c] δυνάμεως καὶ [d] κυριότητος καὶ παντὸς [e] ὀνόματος [f] ὀνομαζομένου

Ch. vi. 10 only; Isa. xl. 26; Dan. iv. 27; see Col. i. 11; 2 Thess. i. 9.

u Ver. 11 reff. v Constr., Col. i. 21, 26; Heb. viii. 10; 2 John 2. w Trans., 1 Cor. vi. 4 only; intrans., see 2 Thess. ii. 4 reff. x=Rom. viii. 34 reff. y Ver. 3 reff. z Ch. iv. 10; Heb. ix. 5 only; Deut. xxvi. 19. abc=Luke xii. 11; Rom. viii. 38; 1 Cor. xv. 24; Col. i. 16, ii. 15; Tit. iii. 1. d Col. i. 16; 2 Pet. ii. 10; Jude 8 only †. e=Acts iv. 12; Phil. ii. 9; Heb. i. 4; Rev. iii. 5. f Luke vi. 13, 14; Acts xix. 13; Rom. xv. 20; 1 Cor. v. 1, 11; ch. iii. 15, v. 13; 2 Tim. ii. 19 only.

[1] ενηργηκεν AB, Euth., Cyr., Procop.; text ℵDEFGKLP, MSS. appy. (Vss. and Lat. Fathers ambiguous), Eus., Cyr., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., al.

[2] For εκαθισεν, καθισας ℵAB 10, 17, 23, 57, 80, al.$_{10}$, Eus., Cyr., Procop., Tert., Jer., Ambr., Pel.; text rest of MSS., mss., it., Copt., Goth., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., Thl., Oec., al. After καθισας insert αυτον ℵA 17, 23, 57, 80, al., Copt., al., Eus., Procop., Lat. Fathers.

[3] For επουρ., ουρανοις B, 71, 213, Hil.

[4] εξουσιας και αρχης B.

ii. 12), that is not what is in view here. The **κατά** is best taken here in its proper sense of *measure, standard* or *proportion*. What the clause sets before us, therefore, is that the *measure* of that surpassing power of God which is the guarantee of our hope, is the operation of the exertion of the might that dwells in God as seen in the historical case instanced in the following sentence, *viz.*, the resurrection and exaltation of Christ.

Ver. 20. **ἣν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν**: *which He wrought in the Christ when He raised Him from the dead*. The **ἣν** refers to the preceding **ἐνέργειαν**. The documentary authorities vary between the **ἐνήργησεν** of the TR (after ℵDFKL, etc.) and **ἐνήργηκεν** which is the reading of BA, etc., and is preferred by LTTr (marg.) WH (with the other in margin). The aorist is more in keeping with the definite historical event referred to; the succeeding aorists on the other hand favour the perfect, making it the more difficult reading to account for. Here again the article with the **Χριστῷ** may give it the official sense "the Christ". This is the more probable in view of the use of the **ἐν** as well as the relation of the statement to the *hope* and the *inheritance*. The surpassing power of God was not only *manifested* in the case of our Lord, but was wrought *in* Him, and in Him not as an individual member of the race, but as "the Christ," the Anointed of God, in whom we are represented and have our Head. The result of that working of God's energy in Him was His resurrection from the dead—an event which, as Paul uniformly teaches, had a power not for Himself only but for us. The **ἐγείρας** may have the force (coincidence in time) given it by the AV and the RV, etc., "when he raised Him"; or it may be better taken as the defining, explanatory aor. (as in **γνωρίσας**, ver. 9), "in that He raised Him".—**καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ**: *and seated Him on His right hand*. The **ἐκάθισεν** of the TR, supported by such MSS. as DFKL, the Copt. and Goth. Versions, etc., must give place to **καθίσας**, the reading of BℵA 17, etc., adopted by LTTrWHRV. A few authorities (ℵA 17, etc.) insert **αὐτόν** before **ἐν δεξιᾷ**. The exaltation to the place of honour and authority following the resurrection is a further witness to what the **ἐνέργεια** of God can effect.—**ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις**: *in the heavenlies*. That the phrase has the *local* sense here (*cf.* on ver. 3 above) is made abundantly clear by the terms **ἐγείρας, καθίσας, ἐν δεξιᾷ**—all terms with a local reference. The phrase **οὐρανοῖς** indeed is found instead of **ἐπουρανίοις** in a few ancient authorities (B, Hil., Vict.).

Ver. 21. **ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος**: *over above all rule, and authority, and power, and lordship*. The intensive force "*far* above" is given to the **ὑπεράνω** by Chrys., Theoph., Stier, the AV, the RV, etc. But it can scarcely be sustained in face of the actual use of the word in Heb. ix. 5 (*cf.* Ezek. xliii. 15); the tendency of late Greek to substitute compound for simple forms without substantial change of sense; the non-intensive use of the cognate form **ὑποκάτω** (Mark vi. 11; Luke viii. 16; John i. 51); and the testimony of the Syriac and other ancient Versions, which render it simply

"above" (*e.g.*, Vulg., *supra*). "Over above," therefore, is to be preferred to "far above". The **πάσης** is "all" in the sense of "every," every particular kind of **ἀρχή** that can be named. The terms are given in the abstract form, not as if only *principles* and *forces* were in view, and not *personal* powers, but because "*classes* or *categories* of personal beings are expressed, just as, *e.g.*, **ἐξουσία** is said of human *authorities*, which consist of *persons*" (Mey.). The use of the abstract **ἀρχαί**, etc., instead of the concrete **ἄγγελοι**, etc., enhances the conception of the absolute, all-embracing dominion of Christ. But what manner of powers or authorities do these terms designate? The fact that the immediate subject here is the *heavenlies* and Christ's position in them at once excludes such interpretations as identify these **ἀρχαί**, etc. with *earthly* powers (Morus); with every kind of dignity wheresoever found (Erasm., Olsh., etc.); with the Jewish hierarchy (Schoett.); or with the various orders of *Gentile* powers (van Til). The leading idea of the section and the apparent purport of similar statements (Eph. iii. 10; Col. i. 16; Rom. viii. 38; 1 Pet. iii. 22) point to the angelic world as meant. The fact that nothing is said here of Christ's triumph over Satanic powers suggests further that only angels of good,—heavenly intelligences, are in view. Can any definite distinction then be made out between the terms? And can it be said that the enumeration means that the world of good angels has its distinct orders and grades of angelic dignity and power? The passage must be read in connection with the analogous enumerations in Eph. iii. 10; Rom. viii. 38; 1 Pet. iii. 22, and especially Col. i. 16. Differences in the enumerations then at once appear. In Eph. iii. 10 we have only the **ἀρχαί** and **ἐξουσίαι**; in Rom. viii. 38, **ἄγγελοι, ἀρχαί, δυνάμεις**; in 1 Pet. iii. 22, **ἄγγελοι, ἐξουσίαι, δυνάμεις.** And in the most direct parallel (Col. i. 16) we find **θρόνοι, κυριότητες, ἀρχαί, ἐξουσίαι.** The Pauline passages themselves, therefore, show no such identity either in the *number* or in the *succession* of authorities as would be consistent with a determinate doctrine of graduated orders. Nor can it be inferred from the words in Matt. xviii. 10 (as Meyer thinks) that such gradations are recognised by our Lord Himself. It is true that in the non-canonical writings of the Jews (*e.g.*, *Test. XII. Patr.*, etc.) the idea of variety of ranks among the angels appears, and that in the later Rabbinical literature it took strange and elaborate forms. But between these and the simple statements of the NT there is no real likeness, and there is nothing here to point certainly either to an *ascending* scale or to a *descending*. It is held by some indeed (*e.g.*, Meyer) that the angelic authorities are named here according to the latter scale, beginning with the highest and proceeding to the lower and the lowest. For this two reasons are offered, *viz.*, *first* that it would be natural for the writer, who has led the reader up to the right hand of God as the position possessed by Christ, to give his enumeration of the powers subject to Christ in the succession of first, second and third in rank; and *second*, that in the various references made to them, the **ἀρχαί, ἐξουσίαι, δυνάμεις** are given in the same order. But the former is a very precarious reason; and the latter is not valid, inasmuch as in none of the passages appealed to do we get all these three terms together (Eph. iii. 10; Col. i. 16, ii. 10; 1 Pet. iii. 22). Nor is it possible to establish any clear distinction of sense and application between the four terms introduced here, such as that attempted, *e.g.*, by Alford who, including in the list *earthly* as well as heavenly powers and *evil* as well as good spirits, regards **ἀρχή** as the supreme expression of dignity, **ἐξουσία** as official power in all its forms, primary or delegated, **δύναμις** as *might* or the "raw material" of power, and **κυριότης**, as the pre-eminence of lordship. We must take the terms, therefore, not as dogmatic terms either teaching or implying any doctrine of graduated ranks, differentiated functions, or organised order in the world of angels, but as rhetorical terms brought together in order to express the unique supremacy and absolute sovereignty proper to Christ, and meaning simply that whatever powers or dignities existed and by whatever names they might be designated, Christ's dominion was above them all. This is suggested also by the further generalisation that follows.—**καὶ παντὸς ὀνόματος ὀνομαζομένου**: *and every name that is named.* The **ὄνομα** here is not to be taken as a title of dignity, but (as the **ὀνομαζομένου** shows) has the simple sense of *name*. There is an advance in the statement of Christ's supreme rank, but it is simply from the idea of a supremacy over all heavenly intelligences to that of a supremacy over all created objects by whatsoever name called.—**οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι**: *not only in this world* (or *age*),

οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ [g]αἰῶνι τούτῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ [h]μέλλοντι· 22. καὶ [g] Matt. xii. 32; Rom. xii. 2 al. fr.
πάντα [i]ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸν [k]ἔδωκεν [l]κεφαλὴν

[h] Matt. xii. 32; Heb. vi. 5. [i] Luke ii. 51 al. fr.; Ps. viii. 6. [k] John iii. 16, 35; ch. iv. 11; Heb. viii. 10, x. 16; Rev. passim. [l=1] Cor. xi. 3; ch. iv. 15; ver. 23; Col. i. 18, ii. 10, 19 only.

but also in that which is to come. The statement of Christ's absolute and unmatched supremacy is brought to its height by this last generalisation, which embraces within its sweep the totality of created objects not only as they now are, but as they may hereafter be in any possible future. The word **αἰών** here as elsewhere, has the idea of *duration* at its foundation. It means "age," "*aeon*," and as used of the *world* presents it, in distinction from **κόσμος**, in its temporal aspect, "this present state of things". The Jews spoke of the period before Messiah's Advent as הָעוֹלָם הַזֶּה, "this age," and of the period introduced by that event as הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא, "the coming age". So the NT writers designate the period preceding the final Return or Parousia of Christ **ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος** (also **ὁ νῦν αἰών**, 1 Tim. vi. 17; **ὁ ἐνεστὼς αἰών**, Gal. i. 4; or simply **ὁ αἰών**, Matt. xiv. 22), and the period beginning with the Parousia **ὁ αἰὼν ὁ μέλλων** (also **ὁ αἰὼν ἐκεῖνος**, Lk. xx. 35; **ὁ αἰὼν ὁ ἐρχόμενος**, Mk. x. 30; Lk. xviii. 30; *cf.* **οἱ αἰῶνες οἱ ἐπερχόμενοι**, Eph. ii. 7).

This paragraph gives simply a positive statement of the exaltation of Christ, His sovereign and unshared supremacy over all. It makes no reference to Jewish or Gnostic speculations inconsistent with this. It is different with the great section in the sister Epistle to the Colossians. There we see that such speculations were rife in at least one of the Churches of the Lycus valley. The statements in that Epistle have an unmistakable reference to theosophic notions akin to the Gnostic ideas of emanations—notions of angelic intermediaries between God and the world; against which the Apostle has to assert the exclusive relation of Christ to the whole system of things, seen and unseen, earthly and celestial, as the Creator of all, the Upholder of all, the One Being in whom resided all the forces pertaining to the maintenance and administration of things. The literature of Judaism makes it also clear that by Paul's time the Jews had constructed a somewhat elaborate system of Angelology, with theories of graduated positions and distinctive functions. The *Book of Enoch* (lxi. 10) speaks of "angels of power and angels of principality". The *Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (xx. 1, 3) describes the heavenly host as consisting of ten troops—lordships, principalities, powers, cherubim, seraphim, thrones, etc. In the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Levi 3) six orders are named, of which the highest are the **θρόνοι, ἐξουσίαι,** occupying the seventh heaven, while the **δυνάμεις** are the fifth in order and are assigned to the third heaven. The same general doctrine appears also in Ephraem Syrus (i., p. 270), who gives three great divisions of the celestial world, *viz.* (1) **θεοί, θρόνοι, κυριότητες**; (2) **ἀρχάγγελοι, ἀρχαί, ἐξουσίαι**; (3) **ἄγγελοι, δυνάμεις, χερουβίμ, σεραφίμ.** In the *De Princip.* of Origen (i., 5, 3, etc.) five orders are named, rising from the **τάξις ἀγγελική** to **ἀρχαί, ἐξουσίαι, θρόνοι,** and finally **κυριότητες.** But the conception of a great, graduated angelic hierarchy was elaborated most fully by the author of the remarkable book, *De Coelesti Hierarchia*, the so-called Dionysius the Areopagite. There we find a scheme of orders in three sets of three, descending from the highest to the lowest: Seraphim, Cherubim, Thrones; Dominations, Virtues, Powers (or Authorities); Principalities, Archangels, Angels. Hence the sublime description in Dante (*Paradiso*, canto xxxviii.) and Milton's "Thrones, Dominations, Princedoms, Virtues, Powers" (*Paradise Lost*, v., 601).

Ver. 22. **καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ**: *and He put all things under His feet.* The **ὑπέταξεν** is coordinate with the previous **ἐνήργησε.** These two things God did: He wrought His mighty power in raising and exalting Christ and He subjected all things to Him. The idea expressed by the **ὑπέταξεν** here is not the limited idea of a subjection of opposing objects, which we have in 1 Cor. xv. 27, but the wider idea of placing all created things under the sovereignty of Christ. The words recall those of Ps. viii. 7, but do not give these in the form of a quotation. That Psalm speaks of Man as he was meant by God to be, with dominion over all the creatures. Here that ideal is presented as made real in Christ, the exalted, sovereign Christ. The act re-

m Absol., Acts ii. 47; see Matt. xvi. 18; epp. passim. n=Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 27; ch. iv. 4 al.; Col. i. 18 al. o Matt. ix. 21; Mark ii. 21, viii. 20; John i. 16; Rom. xi. 12, 25, xiii. 15, xv. 29; 1 Cor. x. 26, 28; Gal. iv. 4; Eph. iii. 19, iv. 13; Col. i. 19, ii. 9. p=ch. v. 10; Col. i. 9; Gal. v. 14.

ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ [m] **ἐκκλησίᾳ, 23. ἥτις ἐστὶ τὸ** [n] **σῶμα αὐτοῦ, τὸ** [o] **πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ** [1] **πάντα** [p] **ἐν πᾶσιν** [o] **πληρουμένου.**

[1] Before **παντ.** om. **τα** some mss.; insert MSS., most mss.-ff.

ferred to, therefore, by the aor. **ὑπέταξεν** may be the definite gift of absolute dominion consequent on the exaltation. The raising of Christ to God's right hand was followed by the placing of all things under His feet and making Him, *de facto*, sovereign over all.—**καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ**: *and gave Him as head over all things to the Church*. The RV agrees with the AV and the Bishops' Bible in rendering it "and gave Him *to be* head". Tynd. and Cran. have "hath made Him above all things the head"; the Rhemish, "hath made Him head over all the Church". The two ideas of Christ's Headship over all things and His Headship over the Church appear to be in the statement. The question is how they are related, and what is the precise idea attaching to each of the significant terms. The **ἔδωκεν** is not to be taken in the technical sense of *appointed, installed* (as expressed by נָתַן, **τιθέναι**), but, as is indicated by the simple dat. **τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ**, in its ordinary sense of *gave*. Christ in the capacity or position here ascribed to Him is presented as a *gift* of God to the Church. Having exalted Him to the highest and invested Him with supreme dominion, God *gives* Him to the Church. The **πάντα** in **ὑπὲρ πάντα** must have the sense it has in **πάντα ὑπέταξεν**, not "all *authorities*," but "all *things*". The **κεφαλή**, therefore, must express an absolute headship over all the created world, visible and invisible, not a particular, higher headship over other subordinate headships, Apostles, Bishops, etc., in the Church. Further, as the subsequent statement about the **σῶμα** shows, it must have the full sense of *head*, organic head, and neither that of *sum* nor that of *highest dignity* only. The term **ἐκκλησία**, again, obviously has here its widest Christian sense. Used by the Greeks to designate an *assembly of the people called for deliberation* (*cf.* Acts xix. 39), and by the LXX as the equivalent of the Hebrew קָהָל, the *congregation of Israel*, especially when called in religious convention (Deut. xxxi. 30, etc.), it expresses in the NT the idea of the fellowship or assembly of believers meeting for worship or for administration. And it expresses this in various degrees of extension, ranging from the small company gathering for worship in one's house (the **ἐκκλησία κατ' οἶκον**, Rom. xvi. 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 19, etc.), or the single congregation of village or city (Acts v. 11, viii. 3; 1 Cor. iv. 17, etc.), to the larger Christian communities of provinces and countries (**τῆς Ἀσίας, Γαλατίας, Ἰουδαίας**, 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 19; 2 Cor. viii. 1; Gal. i. 2, 22), and finally to the Church universal, the Church collectively, the whole fellowship of believers throughout the world (Matt. xvi. 18; 1 Cor. xii. 28; Phil. iii. 6; Col. i. 18, 24, etc.). Here and in the other occurrences in this Epistle the word has this largest extension of meaning, with the further mystical idea of a unity vitally related to Christ, incorporated in Him, and having His life in it. If the terms then are to be so understood, how is their connection in the sentence to be construed? The **τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ** is immediately dependent on **ἔδωκεν**, and cannot well be taken as a *dat. commodi* = "for the good of the Church" (De Wette), as if it were attached immediately to the **ὑπὲρ πάντα**. The **κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα** may then be taken either as in *apposition* to **αὐτόν**—"gave Him, head over all things, to the Church," *i.e.*, gave Him, *this* head over all things, to the Church (Chrys., Stier, etc.); or as having a predicative force—"gave Him *as* head over all things" (Ell., etc.). The latter is to be preferred both as the easier construction and as more congruous with the anarthrous **κεφαλήν**. Thus the purport of the clause is that God, in giving Christ to the Church, gave Him in *the capacity* of Head over all things. There is no distinction or comparison, therefore, between two headships, as if one were over the world or over the state, and the other over the Church. Christ's Headship over the Church, so far as this clause is concerned, is rather implied than expressed. The idea of the Headship over the Church is more distinctly conveyed by the sentence which follows, with the further description of the Church as the **σῶμα Χριστοῦ**. Here the great idea is

still that of the Headship of Christ over all things. Having that supremacy He is given by God to the Church, and as given in the capacity of universal Head He is given to the Church as her Head also.

Ver. 23. **ἥτις ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ**: *which is His body*. The **ἥτις** (not **ἥ**) introduces a profound statement, the interpretation of which is much contested. It is supplementary to the preceding, and further defines the relation between Christ and the Church in respect of His Headship. The **ἥτις**, therefore, has something of its qualitative force, pointing to what belongs to the nature of the Church (Meyer), and in that way giving the ground of God's gift of Christ to the **ἐκκλησία**. Or (with Ell., etc.) it may be taken in the subdued, *explanatory* sense—"which indeed". The word **σῶμα**, which passes readily from its literal meaning into the figurative sense of a *society*, a number of men constituting a social or ethical union (*cf.* Eph. iv. 4), is frequently applied in the NT Epistles to the Church, with or without **τοῦ Χριστοῦ**, as the mystical body of Christ, the fellowship of believers regarded as an organic, spiritual unity in a living relation to Christ, subject to Him, animated by Him, and having His power operating in it. The relation between Christ and the Church, therefore, is not an external relation, or one simply of Superior and inferior, Sovereign and subject, but one of life and incorporation. The Church is not merely an institution ruled by Him as President, a Kingdom in which He is the Supreme Authority, or a vast company of men in moral sympathy with Him, but a Society which is in vital connection with Him, having the source of its life in Him, sustained and directed by His power, the instrument also by which He works.—**τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου**: *the fulness of Him that filleth all in all*. The preceding sentence carries the idea of the *Church* far beyond the limited conception of a concrete institution or outward, visible organisation, and lifts us to the grander conception of a great spiritual fellowship, which is *one* under all varieties of external form and constitution in virtue of the presence of Christ's Spirit in it, and *catholic* as embracing all believers and existing wherever any such are found. It is the conception of the Church which pervades this Epistle (*cf.* iii. 10, 21; v. 23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32). It appears again in similar terms in the sister Epistle (Col. i. 18, 24), and elsewhere in the varied phraseology of the "royal priesthood" (1 Pet. ii. 9) and the "Church of the Firstborn" (Heb. xii. 23). It is this supreme idea of the Church as a spiritual order the essence of which is a living relation to Christ, that receives further expression in the profound sentence with which the paragraph closes. The great difficulty here is with the term **πλήρωμα** itself. The other terms are easier. For the **πάντα** of the TR, which has the most meagre attestation, **τὰ πάντα** (supported by the great uncials, etc.) must be substituted (with Beng., Griesb., LTTr WHRV). The "all" therefore must be taken here in the sense which it has in i. 10—"*the* all," the whole system of things, made by Christ and having in Him the ground of its being, its continuance, its order (Heb. i. 3; Col. i. 16, 17; 1 Cor. viii. 6). The **ἐν πᾶσιν** will have a corresponding extension of meaning, "with all *things*," not merely with all *blessings*, *gifts* or *spiritual requirements*. The universe itself and all the things that make its fulness (*cf.* "the *earth* . . . and the *fulness* thereof," Ps. xxiv. 1) are alike made and maintained by Christ. The prep. is taken by some in its primary force of *in*. But it is difficult then to find a natural sense for the clause; the interpretations proposed, *e.g.*, "in all points" (Harless), "in all modes of manifestation" (Bleek), etc., going beyond the actual terms. It is best to understand it as the instrumental **ἐν**, of which we have an instance in ch. v. 18 (Mey., Ell., Alf., and most) "with all things". Some strangely take **ἐν πᾶσιν** as masc. here, supposing the point to be that Christ supplies in *all His believing members* all the things with which they need to be provided (Haupt, Moule). The **πληρουμένου** may be a pure passive, and so it is taken by some (Vulg., Chrys., etc.). In that case Christ would be described as Himself "filled as to all things". It occurs, however, also as a middle with an active sense (Xen., *Hell.*, v., 4, 56; vi., 2, 14, etc.). So it is rendered here by some of the Versions (Syr., Copt., Goth., Arm.), and the sense of "filling" best suits the context. The middle, however, probably retains something of its proper reciprocal or reflexive force, conveying the idea of filling the totality of things *for Himself*.

What is to be said now of the term **πλήρωμα** itself? There are some interpretations which may at once be set aside, *e.g.*, *the means of fulfilling* (Rück.), the Church being described as the medium or instrument by which Christ accomplishes His destined work of bringing all things back to God; *coetus numer-*

osus, with reference to the *multitude* of those who are subject to Christ (Storr, Rosenm., etc.) ; *perfection*, in the objective sense of the term, the Church being Christ's perfect work (Oltr.)—a meaning which goes beyond the term itself ; *the totality of the aeons*, in the Gnostic sense, Christ and the Church being viewed here in union and the two ideas, "that which makes full" and "that which is made full," being supposed to pass over the one into the other (Baur). The choice is between the active sense of "that which fills or completes" and the passive sense of "that which is filled". The former is favoured by Chrys., Œcum., Aquin., Schwegler, Abb., etc., and it must be admitted to be linguistically possible. Verbals in **-μα**, it is true, have usually the pass. sense, and this one formed from **πληροῦν** (which means both to *fill* and to *fulfil*) would most naturally be taken as = "that which is filled," or "that which is fulfilled or completed". It is argued indeed by Light. in a weighty dissertation on "The meaning of **πλήρωμα**" (*Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*, pp. 257-273) that nouns of this formation are always passive, expressing either the *product* of the action denoted by the active verb, or that action itself regarded as a *completed* thing ; and further that in the case of **πλήρωμα**, if we follow out the idea of *fulfilling* rather than that of *filling*, we shall not require to give it now an active sense and again a passive, but shall be able to take it in all its occurrences as a real *passive*, denoting *result* in one aspect or another. But, while it is possible enough to understand it in this way in all the passages in the Epistles, it is difficult to carry the passive sense through the various occurrences in the Gospels (*e.g.*, Matt. ix. 16 ; Mark ii. 27, viii. 20). Nor does it seem easy to adjust the properly passive sense to all the passages either in the LXX (*cf.* Ezek. v. 2 ; Dan. x. 3), or in profane Greek (*e.g.*, Soph., *Trach.*, 1203 ; Eurip., *Troad.*, 824 ; Philo, *de Abr.*, ii., p. 39), without putting somewhat strained interpretations on some of the cases. The idea, however, that results from allowing **πλήρωμα** to have the active sense here is not germane to the general scope of the paragraph. That idea is that the Church is that which makes Christ Himself complete. A head, however perfect in itself, if it is without members, is something incomplete. So Christ, who is the Head of the Church, requires the Church to make His completeness, just as the Church which is His body requires Him as the Head to make it a complete and living thing. But the main thought of the whole paragraph is what Christ is and does in relation to the universe and the Church, not what the Church is to Him or does for Him, and the **πληρουμένου** cannot have the sense of "Him who is being filled" without putting a forced meaning on the **τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν**. Hence **πλήρωμα** is to be taken in the passive sense here, as is done by most commentators, and the idea is that the Church is not only Christ's body but that which is *filled by Him*. In Col. i. 19, ii. 9 the whole **πλήρωμα**, or every plenitude of the Godhead, the very fulness of the Godhead, the totality of the Divine powers and qualities, is said to be in Christ, so that He alone is to be recognised as Framer and Governor of the world, and there is neither need nor place for any intermediate beings as agents in those works of creating, upholding and administering. Here the conception is that this plenitude of the Divine powers and qualities which is in Christ is imparted by Him to His Church, so that the latter is pervaded by His presence, animated by His life, filled with His gifts and energies and graces. He is the sole Head of the universe, which is supplied by Him with all that is needed for its being and order. He is also the sole Head of the Church, which receives from Him what He Himself possesses and is endowed by Him with all that it requires for the realisation of its vocation.

CHAPTER II. Vv. 1-10. A new paragraph begins at this point. This is denied indeed by some, who would connect the **καὶ ὑμᾶς** of ii. 1 immediately with the **ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας** of i. 19 (Knatchbull), the **ἐνήργησεν** of i. 20 (Bengel), or the **καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν**, etc., of i. 22 (Lachm., Harl.). But none of these connections yields a sufficiently clear and harmonious sense. The last, indeed, which proposes to separate ii. 1 from i. 23 merely by a comma and which would make the **καὶ . . . συνεζωοποίησεν** a statement parallel to the **αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν**, etc., as well as continuous on it, would require **ἡμᾶς** rather than **ὑμᾶς**. All three, too, take seriously from the point and power of the closing verses of chapter i., which are given in a strain of lofty and majestic affirmation suitable to the winding up of a great argument. We have, therefore, a new section here, in which a particular application is made of what has been affirmed in the preceding paragraph. These first ten verses speak of

II. 1. Καὶ ὑμᾶς[1] ὄντας [a]νεκροὺς τοῖς [b]παραπτώμασιν καὶ ταῖς [b]ἁμαρτίαις,[2] 2. ἐν αἷς ποτὲ[3] [c]περιεπατήσατε [c]κατὰ τὸν [d]αἰῶνα τοῦ [d]κόσμου τούτου, [c]κατὰ τὸν [e]ἄρχοντα τῆς [f]ἐξουσίας τοῦ [g]ἀέρος, τοῦ[4]

a=John v. 25; Rom. xi. 15; Col. ii. 13; Rev. iii. 1.

b Here only; παρ. Matt. vi. 14. c Rom. viii. 1, 4, xiv. 15; 1 Cor. iii. 3 al.; 2 John 6.
d Here only; see Gal. i. 4. e=John xii. 31, xiv. 30, xvi. 11. f Ch. i. 21 reff. g Acts xxii. 23; 1 Cor. ix. 26, xiv. 9; 1 Thess. iv. 17; Rev. ix. 2, xvi. 17 only; Ps. xvii. 11.

[1] ημας 44, 45, 48, etc.

[2] For αμαρτ., επιθυμιαις B. After αμ. ins. υμων ℵBDEFGP, d, e, f, g, m[87], Vulg., Syr., Copt., Eth., Goth., Or., Euthal., Thdrt., Luc., Victorin., etc.; text KL, most mss., Ar.-pol., Chr.-text-comm., Dam., Thl., Oec.

[3] Omit, L. [4] τουτου FG, etc.

a further manifestation of that power of God which was seen in the resurrection and exaltation of Christ, namely, in the raising of the Ephesians themselves from the death of sin into a new life unto God, and that not of works but of grace.

Ver. 1. **καὶ ὑμᾶς ὄντας νεκρούς**: *and you, being dead.* The construction is broken, the writer turning off into two relative sentences (vv. 2, 3) before he introduces his leading verb. His original statement is taken up again, as some think, at the **καὶ ὄντας νεκρούς** of ver. 5 (Griesb., Rück., etc.). But the resumption begins rather with the **ὁ δὲ Θεὸς** of ver. 4 (Mey., Ell., etc.). So the **ὑμᾶς ὄντας** here is under the *regimen* of the **συνεζωοποίησε** (ver. 5), and the **καί** has the force of "and you too," "you, also, as well as Christ". The **ὄντας** expresses the condition they were in when God's power wrought in them. The **νεκρούς** means neither *dying* nor *mortal*, nor yet, again, *condemned to death*, but *dead*. Meyer, indeed, contends for the sense of "made liable to eternal death," as he also takes the following **συνεζώοποιησεν, συνήγειρεν, συνεκάθισεν** as proleptic terms. But the whole series of terms is best understood to express things done then and states belonging to the actual present. The **νεκρούς**, therefore, means *ethically* or *spiritually* dead, and what had been said of the power of God in Christ's case is now applied to the case of the readers themselves. The power that raised Christ from the dead and exalted Him is also the power that took them out of the state of spiritual death and gave them a new life and a new dignity with Christ.—**τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις**: *through your trespasses and sins.* On the authority of such uncials as ℵBDG, such Versions as the Syr. and the Vulg., and such Fathers as Theod., **ὑμῶν** is to be inserted after **ἁμαρτίαις**. The dat. is the instrumental dat., "by trespasses," not *in* them, nor even *in respect* of them (Moule). Etymologically, **παράπτωμα** points to sin as a *fall*, and **ἁμαρτία** to sin as *failure*. It is impossible to establish any clear distinction between the two nouns in the plural forms, as if the one expressed *acts* and the other *states* of sin, or as if the former meant single trespasses and the latter all kinds of sins. Here sin is that which makes dead—the cause of the death-state. In the kindred passage in Col. ii. 13 we have the same idea expressed by **τοῖς παραπτώμασι καὶ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν**, if, with the best MSS. and critics, we omit **ἐν**. The TR inserts **ἐν** before **παραπτώμασι**, in which case sin would be presented there as itself the state of death.

Ver. 2. **ἐν αἷς ποτὲ περιεπατήσατε**: *wherein in time past* (RV, "aforetime") *ye walked.* The **αἷς** takes the gender of the nearer noun, but refers to both the **παραπτώμασι** and the **ἁμαρτίαις**. Trespasses and sins were the domain in which they had their habitual course of life in their former heathen days.—**κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου**: *according to the course* (or *age*) *of this world.* As the **ἐν** of the former clause gave the stated sphere within which their pre-Christian life moved, so the **κατά** of this clause and the next gives the standard to which it conformed and the spirit by which it was ruled. The phrase **κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦτον** might have sufficed; the fuller form which introduces both **αἰὼν** and **κόσμος** is more expressive. The **κόσμος** is the world as the objective system of things, and that as evil. The **αἰών** is the world as a world-period—the world as transitory. In such a connection as the present **αἰὼν** comes near what we understand by "the spirit of the age," but is perhaps most happily rendered *course*, as that word conveys the three ideas of *tenor*, *development*, and *limited continuance*. This course of a world which is evil is itself evil, and to live in accordance with it is to live in trespasses and sins.—**κατὰ τὸν ἄρχοντα**

τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος: *according to the prince of the power of the air.* A yet darker colour is now given to the description of the former heathen walk of those addressed. Their life was determined and shaped by the master of all evil, the supreme ruler of all the powers of wickedness. The terms obviously designate Satan, but their precise sense is somewhat difficult to decide. Three different shades of meaning are suggested for **ἐξουσία** here, *viz.*, (*a*) supreme *right* or *power*, in which case the idea would be the prince to whom belongs the authority of the air; (*b*) the *domain* or *sphere* of authority, as possibly in Col. i. 13 (Chrys., Theod., Hofm., Oltr.); (*c*) authority in the *collective* sense, the totality of evil powers, all that is known as evil authority. The third sense is supported in some measure by Rom. xiii. 1, 2, and is preferred by most. The idea thus becomes "the prince who rules over all that is called authority". The **ἀέρος** then is best taken as the gen. of place, denoting the *seat* of this overlordship of evil. The word **ἀήρ** cannot be taken as equivalent to *mundus* (Aquin.) or **οὐρανός** (Olsh.) or **σκότος** (Kl.) or **πνεῦμα** (Hofm.); neither can it express the *quality* of these evil powers—their incorporeal or aeriform nature (Hahn). In all its other NT occurrences (Acts xxii. 23; 1 Cor. ix. 26, xiv. 9; 1 Thess. iv. 17; Rev. ix. 2, xvi. 17) it has the literal sense. It has it here, and it describes these demonic powers as between earth and heaven, in that "supra-terrestrial but subcelestial region (**ὁ ὑπουράνιος τόπος**, Chrys.) which seems to be, if not the abode, yet the haunt of evil spirits" (Ell.). Thus the prince of evil is described as the Lord-Paramount over all the demonic powers; and these demonic powers, as having their seat in the air, are distinguished from the angels whose abode is in heaven (**ἄγγελοι τῶν οὐρανῶν**, Matt. xxiv. 36). The Rabbinical literature has many extraordinary and grotesque speculations about the demons as being *winged* (Talmud, *Chagig.*, 2), as dwelling in the air (R. Bechai, *Pent.*, f. 139, 4), about the souls of devils as dwelling in a firmament under the sphere of the moon (*Tuf haarez*, f. 9, 2), etc. Such fancies were also entertained by the Greek philosophers, *e.g.*, the Pythagoreans (Diog. Laert., viii. 2). But these have little or no relation to the present passage. In Philo and in the Jewish Pseudepigraphic writings things more akin to it are found. There is, *e.g.*, the description of Beliar as the **ἀέριον πνεῦμα** (*Test.* xii. *Patr.* p. 729); of the "prince of this world" as dwelling in the *firmament* (*Ascens. Isa.*, 10); of the "air" as peopled by *souls* (Philo, *Gig.*, i. 263). But even these form very partial analogies, and the passages in the *Book of Enoch* (ch. xv., 10, 11, 12; xvi., 1), which have been taken to refer to the subject, are of uncertain interpretation (*cf.* Charles, *Book of Enoch*, p. 84). We have no definite knowledge, therefore, of the origin of this idea. But it seems to have been familiar enough to the readers to require no explanation.—**τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ νῦν ἐνεργοῦντος ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας**: *of the spirit that worketh now in the sons of disobedience.* How is the gen. **τοῦ πνεύματος** to be construed? It naturally suggests itself to regard the "spirit" now mentioned as in apposition to the "prince" just described. But to understand the gen. here as continuing the acc. **ἄρχοντα** (Rück., De Wette, Bleek, etc.) is to take too violent a liberty with grammar. The **τοῦ πνεύματος** is under the regimen of the **ἄρχοντα** as the **ἐξουσίας** is, and it adds something to the idea. The ruler over all that is called authority is also the ruler over this particular spirit. It is objected that the designation of a ruler over *a spirit* is an anomaly. But we have a parallel in the Pauline description of Christ as **Κυρίου πνεύματος** (2 Cor. iii. 18). The **πνεῦμα** here is not the spirit or mind of *man* (which would be inconsistent with the force of the **ἐξουσίας**), nor is it a *collective* term equivalent to the **ἐξουσία** (for its form is against that, as is also the statement of its operation). It is either (*a*) the evil *principle* or *power* that comes into men from Satan, *cf.* **τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου**, 1 Cor. ii. 12; **τὸ τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου**, 1 John iv. 3; **ἕτερον πνεῦμα λαμβάνειν**, Eph. iv. 23; or (*b*) the personal Spirit—that particular Spirit whose domain and work are in evil men. The latter is perhaps to be preferred, as in more definite accordance with the contrast with the Holy Spirit of God which seems to be in view. By **ἀπειθεία** is meant not merely *unbelief*, but *disobedience*. Its stated sense in the NT is that of "obstinate opposition to the Divine will" (Thay.-Grimm, *sub voce*). The term **υἱός** in its topical sense and followed by the gen. of a *thing*, expresses what is in intimate relation to the thing, what belongs to it and has it as its innate quality. "Sons of disobedience" are those to whom disobedience is their very nature and essential character, who belong wholly to it. It is a well-known Hebrew idiom, occurring often in the NT, especially in the case of Hebraisms of trans-

[h] πνεύματος τοῦ νῦν [i] ἐνεργοῦντος ἐν τοῖς [k] υἱοῖς τῆς [k] ἀπειθείας, 3. ἐν h=Luke ix. 55; Rom. viii. 15; 1 Cor. iv. 21; 2 Tim. i. 7; 1 John iv. 1 ff.
οἷς καὶ ἡμεῖς [l] πάντες [2] [l] ἀνεστράφημεν ποτὲ ἐν ταῖς [m] ἐπιθυμίαις
τῆς [m] σαρκὸς ἡμῶν, ποιοῦντες τὰ [n] θελήματα τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ τῶν
[o] διανοιῶν, καὶ ἦμεν [3] [p] τέκνα [q] φύσει [p] ὀργῆς [4] ὡς καὶ [r] οἱ λοιποί·

i Ch. i. 11 reff. k Ch. v. 6; Col. iii. 6 only; υἱ. = John xvii. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 5; see Isa. lvii. 4; ἀπ. Rom. xi. 30, 32; Heb. iv. 6, 11 †. l=2 Cor. i. 12 (and constr.); 1 Tim. iii. 15; 1 Pet. i. 17; 2 Pet. ii. 18; see Heb. x. 33; Ezek. xix. 6. m Gal. v. 16; 1 Pet. ii. 11; 1 John ii. 16. n Plur., Acts xiii. 22 only, and Jer. xxiii. 26. o=Col. i. 21; ch. iv. 18; see note. p=Matt. xi. 19; John i. 12 al.; Rom. ix. 8; ch. v. 8; 1 Pet. i. 14; 2 Pet. ii. 14; Isa. lvii. 4. q Rom. ii. 14; Gal. ii. 15, iv. 8 only. r 1 Thess. iv. 13, v. 6; 1 Tim. v. 20; Rev. xi. 13 al.

[1] και ημεις om. FGL; νμ. ADK.

[2] παντ. om. 17, 68, 74, 115, v.-ms., Syr., Ar.-erp., Tert., Ambrst.; παντες ημ. 73; *et nos et omnes* Fortun-in Aug.

[3] For ημεν, ημεθα ℵB 17, 73, Orig.$_4$; text ADEFGKLP, Clem., Did., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., al.

[4] φυσ. τεκ. ADEFGLP 3, 37, 80, 106-8-16, It., Vlg., Arm., Orig.$_1$, Did., Thdrt., Lat. Fathers; text ℵBK, al. pler. Orig.$_3$, Chr., Dam., Tert.; φυσει om. 109, Eth., Clem.; τεκνα οργης φυσει Cyr.; οργης τεκνα Clem.

lation. But the same or similar forms are found now and again in profane Greek, especially in inscriptions and in dignified speech (*cf.* Plato's use of ἔκγονος, *Phaedr.*, p. 275 D), the υἱὸς τύχης of the Tragedians, etc.; see Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, pp. 161-166. The νῦν does not refer to the present in contrast with the future of the Parousia (Olsh.), nor with any other future; nor again is it = "*Even* now," which would have been καὶ νῦν. It looks back upon the previous πότε, and contrasts the present working of the πνεῦμα with the past. *Once* that spirit worked in all those addressed; *now* it works not in them indeed, but in those given over to disobedience to God's will. So the lordship belonging to the Prince of evil extends not only over all those malign powers whose seat is in the air, but also and more particularly over that Spirit who operates as an energy of wickedness in the hearts of men opposed to God.

Ver. 3. ἐν οἷς καὶ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἀνεστράφημέν ποτε: *among whom also we all had our life and walk aforetime.* The AV gives "also we all"; Tynd., Cov., Gen., "we also had"; Bish., "we all had"; RV, "we also all". The ἐν οἷς cannot mean "in which *trespasses*" (so Syr., Jer., Beng., etc.); for the ὑμῶν of ver. 1 is against that, and the form would have been ἐν αἷς as ruled by the nearest noun ἁμαρτίαις. It can only refer to the υἱοὶ τῆς ἀπειθείας. The καὶ ἡμεῖς πάντες is in contrast with the καὶ ὑμᾶς of ver. 1 and the περιεπατήσατε of ver. 2. Paul had begun by speaking of the moral condition of these Gentiles before their conversion. He now adds that these Gentiles were in no exceptional position in that respect, but that all, Jews as well as Greeks, Jewish-Christians like himself no less than Gentile Christians like his readers, had been among those who once lived in obstinate disobedience to God. Paul seldom misses the opportunity of declaring the universal sinfulness of men, the dire level of corruptness on which all, however they differed in race or privilege, stood. So here the ἡμεῖς πάντες is best taken in its utmost breadth—not merely "all the Jewish-Christians" (Mey.), but = the whole body of us Christians, Jewish and Gentile alike included. For the περιεπατήσατε of ver. 2 we have now ἀνεστράφημεν, "had our conversation" (AV), "conversed" (Rhem.), "lived" (RV). Like the Heb. חָלַךְ it denotes one's walk, his active, open life, his way of conducting himself.—ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν: *in the lusts of our flesh.* Definition of the domain or element in which their life once was spent. It kept within the confines of the appetites and impulses proper to fallen human nature or springing from it. The noun ἐπιθυμία has its usual sense of *craving*, the craving in particular of what is forbidden; σάρξ in like manner has its large, theological sense, human nature as such, in its physical, mental and moral entirety, considered as apart from God and under the dominion of sin.—ποιοῦντες τὰ θελήματα τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ τῶν διανοιῶν: *doing the desires of the flesh and of the thoughts.* The ποιοῦντες is sufficiently represented by the "doing" of Wycl., Cov., Rhem., RV.

s=here only; see ch. i. 7, 18. t Constr., 1 Tim. vi. 18; James ii. 5. u Rom. ix. 23 al.; Luke i. passim. v Ch. i. 7; Luke ii. 8; John vii. 24; 1 Tim. i. 18 al. w Ver. 1. x Col. ii. 13 only †. y=Rom. iii. 24, and Paul passim.

4. ὁ δὲ θεὸς, [s]πλούσιος ὢν [t]ἐν[1] [u]ἐλέει, διὰ τὴν πολλὴν ἀγάπην
αὐτοῦ[2] [v]ἣν ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς, 5. καὶ ὄντας ἡμᾶς[3] [w]νεκροὺς τοῖς
[w]παραπτώμασιν[4] [x]συνεζωοποίησεν[5] τῷ χριστῷ ([y]χάριτί[6] ἐστε σεσωσ-

[1] Omit εν א.

[2] αυτου om. DFG 73, 118, d, e, g, Lat. Fathers; insert before αγαπ. 30, 115-20.

[3] ημας om. 73, 118, Cyr.-Jer.

[4] For τοις παραπτ., ταις αμαρτιαις DE, etc.; εν τ. παραπτ. B, Syr., Copt., al.; B adds και ταις επιθυμιαις.

[5] Insert εν before τω Χριστω B 17, 73, 118, tol, Copt., Arm., Chr., Dam., Victorin., etc.

[6] Before χαριτι insert ου (=*cujus*), DEFG, d, e, f, g, Vulg., Victorin., Ambrosiast., Aug., etc.; ου τη D*E.

The AV and other Versions give "fulfilling". The word **θέλημα** is of very rare occurrence, except in biblical and ecclesiastical Greek. It denotes properly the *thing willed*, but is used also of the Divine *purpose* (*e.g.*, Eph. i. 9), or *command* (*e.g.*, Eph. v. 17), etc. Here, as also in John i. 13, it denotes *inclination* or *desire*. The pl. **διανοιῶν** is best rendered "thoughts," with Wycl., Cov., Rhem. and RV margin; RV text, following the AV and other Versions, gives "mind". In the LXX the singular represents the OT לֵב, and denotes the *mind* in the large sense, inclusive of understanding, feeling and desiring. It is only the context that gives it the sense of *wicked* thoughts. Two sources of evil desire and impulse, therefore, are indicated here, *viz.*, our fallen nature in general and the laboratory of perverted thoughts, impressions, imaginations, volitions, in particular.—**καὶ ἦμεν τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς**: *and were children by nature of wrath*. "Children," rather than "*the* children," as it is given by AV and all the other old English Versions (except Wycl., who has "the sons"). From what he and his fellow-Christians *did* in their pre-Christian life, Paul turns now to what they *were* then. The statement is so constructed as to throw the chief emphasis on the **ἦμεν** and the **ὀργῆς**. For **ἦμεν** the better attested form is **ἤμεθα**. Some good MSS. and Versions (ADGLP, Syr.-Harcl., Vulg.) read **φύσει τέκνα**, and that order is accepted by Lachmann, while a place is given it in the margin by Tregelles. The order **τέκνα φύσει**, however, which is that of אBK, Chrys., etc., and both the TR and the RV, is to be preferred. The **ἦμεν** makes it clear that it is no longer *doing* (**ποιοῦντες**) simply that is in view, but *being*, *condition*. The **τέκνα** is the same kind of idiomatic phrase as the former **υἱοί**, only, if possible, stronger and more significant. It describes those in view as not only worthy of the **ὀργή**, but actually *subject* to it, definitely *under* it. But what is this **ὀργή** itself? It is not to be identified with *punitive righteousness* (**τιμωρία**), *punishment* (**κόλασις**), future *judgment*, or the *effect* of God's present judgment of men, but denotes the *quality* or *affectus* of wrath. But is it *man's* wrath or *God's?* The word is certainly used of the passion of wrath in us (Eph. iv. 31; Col. iii. 8; Jas. i. 19, etc.), and so the whole phrase is understood by some to mean nothing more than that those referred to were given to violent anger or ungovernable impulse (*e.g.*, Maurice, *Unity*, p. 538). But this would add little or nothing to what was said of the lusts of the flesh and thoughts, and would strip the whole statement of its point, its solemnity, and its universality. It is the Divine wrath that is in view here; as it is, indeed, in thirteen out of twenty occurrences in the Pauline writings, and that, too, whether with or without the definite article or the defining **Θεοῦ** (*cf.* Moule, *in loc.*). This holy displeasure of God with sin is not inconsistent with His love, but is the reaction of that love against the denial of its sovereign rights of responsive love. The term **φύσις**, though it may occasionally be applied to what is *habitual* or to character as *developed*, means properly what is *innate*, *implanted*, in one by *nature*, and this with different shades of meaning (*cf.*, *e.g.*, Rom. ii. 14; Gal. ii. 15, iv. 8, etc.). The clause means, therefore, that in their pre-Christian life those meant by

the **ἡμεῖς πάντες** were in the condition of subjection to the Divine wrath; and that they were so not by deed merely, nor by circumstance, nor by passing into it, but by nature. Their universal sin has been already affirmed. This universal sin is now described as sin by nature. Beyond this Paul does not go in the present passage. But the one is the explanation of the other. Universal sin implies a law of sinning, a sin that is of the nature; and this, again, is the explanation of the fact that all are under the Divine wrath. For the Divine wrath operates only where sin is. Here is the essential meaning of the doctrine of *original sin*. That it finds any justification here is denied, indeed, by some; even by Meyer, who admits, however, that elsewhere (*e.g.*, in Rom. vi.) Paul teaches that there is a principle of sin in man by nature, and that man sins actually because of that innate principle. But he argues that it is in virtue not of the principle itself, but of the acts of sin by which that principle expresses itself, that we are in a state of subjection to the Divine wrath. This, however, is to make a nature which originates sinful acts and which does that in the case of all men without exception, itself a neutral thing.

Ver. 4. **ὁ δὲ Θεὸς, πλούσιος ὢν ἐν ἐλέει**: *but God* (or, God, however), *being rich in mercy*. A return is now made to the statement which was interrupted at ver. 2. The resumption might have been made by **οὖν**. The adversative **δέ**, however, is the more appropriate, as the other side of our case is now to be set forth—the Divine grace which meets the sinful, condemned condition, and which stands over the dark background of our death by sin and our subjection by nature to the Divine wrath. God who is wroth with sin, is a God of grace. His disposition towards those who are dead by trespasses and sins is one of mercy, and this no stinted mercy, but a mercy that is *rich*, exhaustless (for **πλούσιος, πλουτίζειν**, etc., *cf.* 1 Cor. i. 5; 2 Cor. ix. 11; 1 Tim. vi. 17, 18; Jas. ii. 5).—**διὰ τὴν πολλὴν ἀγάπην ἣν ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς**: *by reason of His great love wherewith He loved us*. The use of the cogn. acc. **ἣν** adds to the force of the idea; *cf.* the use of the same phrase by our Lord Himself with reference to His Father's love, John xvii. 26. If *mercy* is God's attitude to sinful men, *love* is His motive in all that He does with them; and as the mercy is "rich" so the love is "great". With this great love God loved us when He chose us, and it is *on account of* that love (not "through" it, as Luther puts it) that He acts with us as He does. The **ἡμᾶς** has the widest sense here—all of us, whether Jew or Gentile.

Ver. 5. **καὶ ὄντας ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν**: *even when we were dead by our trespasses*. The condition of death in which we are by nature is now reaffirmed, and in a still more emphatic way than in ver. 1. The **καί** is not the copula, simply attaching one statement to another (Mey.), nor a mere repetition of the **καί** of the opening verse, nor = "also," "also us" collectively (which would require **καί ἡμᾶς**), but the ascensive **καί** = *even* (Syr.-Phil., AV, RV, Ell., etc.). It qualifies the **ὄντας** (while the **νεκροὺς** is thrown emphatically forward), and heightens the sense of the *greatness* of the Divine power—as a power operating on us when we were yet held fast in the state of inexorable death. The **τοῖς** defines the trespasses as those already mentioned in connection with that state of death, and so has much the sense of "our".—**συνεζωοποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ**: *quickened us together with the Christ*. Some authorities (including B 17, Arm.) insert **ἐν** before **τῷ Χριστῷ**; which is favoured so far by Lachm. and gets a place in the margin with WH and RV. But the mass of authorities omit it. The **συν-**, therefore, of the compound verb refers to the **Χριστῷ**, and the idea expressed is that of fellowship with Him, not the fellowship or comprehension of Jew and Gentile alike in the Divine act of quickening (Beza). Here again the article probably designates Christ in His official relation to us. The *quickening* here in view is understood by some (including Meyer) to refer to the first act in the raising of the dead at the great day; the following verbs **συνήγειρεν, συνεκάθισεν** being similarly understood in the literal sense, as referring proleptically to events that belong to the ultimate future. Thus the *standing* rather than the moral condition is supposed to be primarily in view, the idea being that when Christ was raised from the dead we also as members of His body were raised in principle with Him, so that the resurrection of the future which we await will be simply the application to the individual of what was accomplished once for all for the whole of His members then. It must be admitted that the analogous passage in Col. ii. 12, 13, which associates the *quickening* with the forgiveness of trespasses and the blotting out of the hand-writing of ordinances, on the whole favours that interpretation. Looking, however, to the express and particular

μένοι) 6. καὶ [z] συνήγειρεν καὶ [a] συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς [b] ἐπουρανίοις ἐν
z Col. ii. 12, iii. 1 only; Exod. xxiii. 5 alex.
χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ,[1] 7. ἵνα [c] ἐνδείξηται ἐν τοῖς [d] αἰῶσιν τοῖς [d] ἐπερχομένοις
τὸ [e] ὑπερβάλλον [f] πλοῦτος [2] τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ ἐν [g] χρηστότητι [3] [h] ἐφ'
a Trans., here only, intr., Luke xxii. 55; Exod. xviii. 13. b Ch. i. 3 reff. c Rom. ix. 17, from Exod. ix. 16; 1 Tim. i. 16 al(8), but Paul only. d Here only; ἐπ.=Luke xxi. 26; James v. 1.
e Ch. i. 19 reff. f Ch. i. 7 reff. g Rom. ii. 4 al(8), but Paul only. h See i. 19, εἰς ἡμ.

[1] εν X. I. om. FG, g, Hil.; *cum Chr. Jes.* Fortun.; omit Ιησου Orig., Cyr.

[2] τον υπερβαλλοντα πλουτον, with D^3ELP, Or., Euseb., Chr., Thdrt., etc.; το υπερβαλλον πλουτος ℵBADFG 17, 67^2, Orig., Euth., etc.

[3] Before χρηστ. insert τη DE.

description of the worldly walk and the conversation in the lusts of the flesh, which is given in vers. 2, 3, and which seems to explain what is said in ver. 1 of the state of being "dead by trespasses and sins"; and having regard also to the application to the moral life which is made in the second half of the Epistle, most interpreters understand the *quickening* here affirmed to be that of regeneration—the communication of spiritual life.—**χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι**: *by grace have ye been saved.* So the RV, while the AV is content with "are ye saved". The idea is that they were saved and continued to be so. The **χάριτι** is put emphatically first—"by grace it is that ye have been saved". The parenthetical mention of *grace* is in place. Nothing else than grace could give life to the dead, but grace could indeed do even that.

Ver. 6. **καὶ συνήγειρεν**: *and raised us with Him.* That is, to life now, in a present spiritual renewal. The **συνήγειρεν** expresses the definite idea of *resurrection*, and primarily that of the physical resurrection. The introduction of this term and the following makes it not improbable that both ideas, that of the present moral resurrection and that of the future bodily resurrection, were in Paul's mind, and that he did not sharply distinguish between them, but thought of them as one great gift of life.—**καὶ συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις**: *and seated us* (or, enthroned us) *with Him in the heavenlies.* Made us sharers with Him in dignity and dominion, so that even now, and in foretaste of our future exaltation, our life and thought are raised to the heavenlies where He reigns. But as Bengel notices, Paul pauses here and does not add the **ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ** which is said of Christ in i. 20—**ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ**: *in Christ Jesus.* Not the **συνεκάθισεν** only, but the whole statement is qualified by this. This quickening, this resurrection, this seating of us with Him take effect in so far as we are *in* Him as our Representative, having our life and our completeness in our Head.

Ver. 7. **ἵνα ἐνδείξηται ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσιν τοῖς ἐπερχομένοις τὸν ὑπερβάλλοντα πλοῦτον τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ**: *that He might shew forth in the ages that are coming the exceeding riches of His grace.* For the **τὸν ὑπερβάλλοντα πλοῦτον** of the TR the neuter form **τὸ ὑπερβάλλον πλοῦτος** is preferred by most editors (LTTrWHRV). The satisfaction of His love was God's motive in quickening and raising them. The manifestation of His glory in its surpassing wealth is His final purpose in the same. The verb **ἐνδείκνυσθαι** occurs eleven times in the Pauline Epistles and Hebrews, and nowhere else in the NT. The active is very rare even in the classics, and is never found in the NT. Hence the **ἐνδείξηται** is to be taken as a simple active (not as=shew forth *for Himself*), all the more by reason of the **αὐτοῦ**. What is meant by the **τοῖς αἰῶσιν τοῖς ἐπερχομένοις**? Some give it the widest possible sense, *e.g.*, *per omne vestrum tempus reliquum quum in hac vita tum in futura quoque* (Morus), "the successively arriving ages and generations from that time to the second coming of Christ" (Ell.). But it is rather another form of the **αἰὼν ὁ μέλλων** (Harl., Olsh., Mey., Haupt, etc.), the part. **ἐπερχόμενος** being used of the future (*e.g.*, Jer. xlvii. 11; Isa. xli. 4, 22, 23, xlii. 23; Luke xxi. 26; Jas. v. 1, etc.), and the future being conceived of as made up of an undefined series of periods. In other cases reduplicated expressions, **αἰῶνες τῶν αἰώνων**, etc., are used to express the idea of eternity. God's purpose, therefore, is that in the eternal future, the future which opens with Christ's Parousia, and in all the continuing length of that future, the grace of His ways with those once dead in sins should be declared and understood in all the grandeur of its exceeding riches. —**ἐν χρηστότητι ἐφ' ἡμᾶς**: *in kindness*

ἡμᾶς ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.[1] 8. τῇ γὰρ [i]χάριτί [2] ἐστε σεσωσμένοι [k]διὰ [3]τῆς πίστεως, [l]καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ [m]ἐξ ὑμῶν,[4] θεοῦ τὸ [n]δῶρον· 9. οὐκ [m]ἐξ ἔργων, ἵνα μή τις [o]καυχήσηται. 10. αὐτοῦ [5] γάρ ἐσμεν [p]ποίημα,[6]

i Ver. 5 reff. k Rom. iii. 22, 30; 2 Cor. v. 7, 9 al., ii. 16, iii. 26; Phil. iii. 9; Col. ii. 12 al.; 1 Pet. i. 5; =see Acts xv. 9. l 1 Cor. vi. 6; Phil. i. 28. m 2 Cor. iii. 5; 1 Cor. i. 30. n=here only; δωρεά, John iv. 10; 2 Cor. ix. 15 al. o Rom. ii. 17 al(34), but Paul only, exc. James i. 9; iv. 16, not in Col.; so also καύχημα and καύχησις, exc. James iv. 16. p Rom. i. 20 only; Gal. viii. 17.

[1] ιησ. om. DEFG, d, e, g, Eth., Victorin., etc.

[2] αυτου χαριτι σεσ. εσμεν DE, d, e, al., Vss.

[3] Before πιστεως om. της ℵBD[1]FG 17, 67[2], 76, 80, Chr., Thl.-text, etc.; insert DEKL, most mss., Thdrt., Dam., Thl.-comm., Oec.

[4] υμων DFG 46, 52, 73, etc., Arm. Chr., Dam., etc.

[5] θεου γαρ ℵ.

[6] ποιηματα 47.

toward us. The **ἐν** is taken by some (Mey., etc.) as the instrumental **ἐν**, "by means of kindness". It is more natural to give it the proper force of "in," as defining the *way* in which the grace showed itself in its surpassing riches. It was in the form of kindness directed towards us. The **χρηστότης**, which means *moral goodness* in Rom. iii. 12, has here the more usual sense of *benignity* (*cf.* Rom. ii. 4, xi. 12; 2 Cor. vi. 6; Gal. v. 22; Col. iii. 12; Tit. iii. 4).—**ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ**: *in Christ Jesus.* Again is Paul careful to remind his readers that all this grace and the manifestation of it in its riches have their ground and reason in Christ.

Ver. 8. **τῇ γὰρ χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι**: *for by grace have ye been saved.* More exactly "by the grace," *i.e.*, by this grace, the grace already mentioned. *Grace* is the explanation of their own salvation, and how surpassingly rich the grace must be that could effect that!—**διὰ τῆς πίστεως**: *through faith.* That is, by faith as the instrument or means. Paul never says **διὰ τὴν πίστιν**, as if the faith were the ground or procuring cause of the salvation. It is the **χάριτι**, too, not the explanatory **πίστεως** that has the first place in Paul's thoughts here.—**καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐξ ἡμῶν**: *and that not of yourselves.* That is, not as *proceeding from* yourselves or of your own performance. The sentence thus beginning with **καὶ τοῦτο** (*cf.* Rom. xiii. 11) is not parenthetical, but an integral part of the statement. But to what does the **τοῦτο** refer? To the **πίστεως** say some (Chrys., Theod., Jer., Bez., Beng., Bisp., Moule, etc.). The neut. **τοῦτο** would not be irreconcilable with that. The formula **καὶ τοῦτο** indeed might rather favour it, as it often adds to the idea to which it is attached. It may also be granted that a peculiarly suitable idea results—the opportune reminder that even their *faith*, in which at least they might think there was something of their own, has its origin in God's grace, not in their own effort. But on the other hand the *salvation* is the main idea in the preceding statement, and it seems best to understand the **καὶ τοῦτο** as referring to that salvation in its entire compass, and not merely to the one element in it, its instrumental cause, appended by way of explanation. **Θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον**: *it is the gift of God.* Or, perhaps, "God's gift it is". The salvation is not an achievement but a *gift*, and a gift from none other than God. This declaration of the free, unmerited, conferred nature of the salvation is made the stronger not only by the contrast with the **ἐξ ὑμῶν**, but by the dropping of any connecting particle.

Ver. 9. **οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, ἵνα μή τις καυχήσηται**: *not of works, that no one should glory.* The OT protest against glorying in any but the Lord and the prophet's jealousy for the honour of God (Jer. ix. 23, 24; Is. xlii. 8, 14, etc.) burn with a yet intenser flame in Paul, most of all when he touches the great theme of man's salvation. That the glory of that salvation belongs wholly to God and in no degree to man, and that it has been so planned and so effected as to take from us all ground for boasting, is enforced on Paul's hearers again and again, in different connections, with anxious concern and utmost plainness of expression (*cf.* Rom. iii. 17; 1 Cor. i. 29, iv. 7; Gal. vi. 14; Phil. iii. 3, etc.).

Ver. 10. **αὐτοῦ γάρ ἐσμεν ποίημα**: *for we are His workmanship* (or, handiwork). The **αὐτοῦ** is emphatic—"*His* handiwork are we". The word **ποίημα** occurs only once again in the NT (Rom. i. 20, with reference to the works of

q=ch. iii. 9, [q] κτισθέντες ἐν χριστῷ [p] Ἰησοῦ [r] ἐπὶ [s] ἔργοις [s] ἀγαθοῖς, [t] οἷς [u] προητοί-
iv. 24;
Col. i. 16, μασεν ὁ θεὸς ἵνα [v] ἐν αὐτοῖς [v] περιπατήσωμεν.
iii. 10 al.
r=Gal. v. 13; 1 Thess. iv. 7. s Acts ix. 36; Rom. ii. 7, xiii. 3 al. fr. t Attr., ii. 7 reff. u Rom. ix. 23 only; Isa. xxviii. 24. v Rom. vi. 4; 2 Cor. iv. 2, x. 3, ch. v. 2; Col. ii. 6, iv. 5; 1 John i. 6, 7 al.
w W. ὅτι, Paul only; Acts xx. 31; 2 Thess. ii. 5. x=John ix. 13; Rom. vii. 9, xi. 30 al.
y Rom. ii. 28 reff.

[1] δια τουτο μνημονευοντες υμ. οι ποτε . . . FG, Dial.$_1$. Rec. υμ. ποτε ℵ^{3}D^{2}KLP, Syr.-P., Chr., Thdrt., etc.; ποτε υμεις ℵ*ABDE 17, 37, 73, 115, 116, d, e, f, Vulg., Dial., Diod., etc.

nature). Here, as the following clause shows, it expresses not *appointment* to something, but an actual *making*. The clause gives the reason for the statement that our salvation is not of *works*. We ourselves are a *work*, the handiwork of God, made anew by Him, and our salvation, therefore, is due to Him, not to ourselves.—**κτισθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς**: *created in Christ Jesus for good works*. Further definition of the **ποίημα αὐτοῦ**. We are God's spiritual handiwork, in the sense that we were *created* by Him, made a new spiritual *creature* by Him when His grace made us Christians. This new creation was *in Christ*, so that except by union between Him and us it could not have taken place (Eph. ii. 15, iv. 24; 2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15; Col. iii. 10). Also it was *with a view* to good works, **ἐπί** being used here (much as in Gal. v. 13; 1 Thess. iv. 7; 2 Tim. ii. 14) to express *object; cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 492. We ourselves then having been created anew by God, and good works being the *object* to which that new creation looked, not the cause that led to it, all must be of grace not of deeds (**ἔργων**), and there can be no room for boasting.—**οἷς προητοίμασεν ὁ Θεὸς**: *which God afore prepared*. The **οἷς** cannot with any propriety be construed as a masc., "for whom He before appointed" (Erasm.); nor can it well be taken as the dat. of destination, "unto which God prepared us" (Luth., Schenkel, etc.); for that would require the insertion of a **ἡμᾶς**. Nor, again, can it be taken in the intrans. sense, so as to give the idea "for which God made previous preparation" (Stier); for while **ἑτοιμάζειν** *may* be used intransitively (Luke ix. 52), the compound verb does not appear to be so used. It is best taken (with the Syr., Goth. and Vulg. Versions and the best exegetes) as a case of attraction—**οἷς** for **ἅ**. The **προετοιμάζειν** is not quite the same as **προορίζειν**. It means to *prepare* or *place in readiness before*, not specifically to *foreordain* (Aug., Harl.). The **προ-** describes the *preparation* as prior to the *creation* (**κτισθέντες**). The subjects of the preparation also are the *good works themselves*, not the *ways* in which they are to be done. In relation to the question of human merit or glorying, therefore, good works are viewed in two distinct aspects. They are the goal to which God's new creation of us looked; they are also in God's eternal plan. Before He created us in Christ by our conversion He had destined these good works and made them ready for us in His purpose and decree. There is the unseen source from which they spring, and there is their final explanation. —**ἵνα ἐν αὐτοῖς περιπατήσωμεν**: *that we should walk in them*. God's purpose in the place which He gave to good works in His decree was that they should actually and habitually be done by us. His final object was to make good works the very element of our life, the domain in which our action should move. That this should be the nature of our walk is implied in our being His handiwork, made anew by Him in Christ; that the good works which form the Divine aim of our life shall be realised is implied in their being designed and made ready for us in God's decree; and that they are of God's originating, and not of our own action and merit, is implied in the fact that we had ourselves to be made a new creation in Christ with a view to them.

Vv. 11-22. The second half of this chapter makes a paragraph by itself. Its subject is the case of those Gentile believers whom Paul has immediately in view—their heathen past and their Christian present. They are reminded of what they once were—outside Christ, outside the special privilege of Israel, without hope, and without God; and of what they have come to be by the power of Christ's death—placed on an equality with the chosen people, brought nigh to the Father, made part of the house-

[z] λεγόμενοι [a] ἀκροβυστία ὑπὸ τῆς [z] λεγομένης [b] περιτομῆς [y] ἐν σαρκὶ [z] Matt. x. 2; Acts iii. 2; 1 Cor. viii. 5; 2 Thess. ii. 4 al. [a] Paul only, exc. Acts xi. 3; Gen. xvii. 11, etc. [b] Paul only, exc. John vii. 22, 23; Acts vii. 8, x. 45, xi. 2; Exod. iv. 26. [c] Mark xiv. 58; Acts vii. 48, xvii. 24; Heb. ix. 11, 24 only; Isa. ii. 18, of idols. [d] Rom. iii. 21 al. [e] Ch. iv. 18; Col. i. 21 only; Ps. lxviii. 8.
[c] χειροποιήτου, 12. ὅτι ἦτε τῷ καιρῷ[1] ἐκείνῳ [d] χωρὶς χριστοῦ [e] ἀπηλ-

[1] Rec. before τω καιρ. insert εν with D[3]EKLP, Vss., Fathers; om. ℵABD[1]FG, Chr.-comm., Epiph., Cyr., Lat. Fathers.

hold of God and the living temple of the Lord.

Ver. 11. **Διὸ μνημονεύετε ὅτι ὑμεῖς ποτὲ**: *Wherefore remember that aforetime ye.* The order of the TR, **ὑμεῖς ποτέ**, is supported by such authorities as ℵ[3]D[3]G (with **οἱ** before **ποτέ**), Syr.-Harcl., etc. Some authorities place the **ποτέ** after the **ἔθνη** (Syr.-P., Boh.). But **ποτὲ ὑμεῖς** is the order of the best and oldest MSS. (ℵ*ABD*), the Vulg., etc., and is adopted by most (LTTrWHRV). As **διὸ** indicates, what follows is a personal, ethical application of what has been said; and the application is drawn not from the immediately preceding sentence, but from the contents of the prior paragraph as a whole. The great things done for them by God's grace should incline them to think of the past from which they have been delivered. The remembrance of that past will make them more thankful for their present privilege, and more careful to walk in the good works which God has in view for them. The sentence is interrupted by descriptive clauses, but is taken up again in the next verse; where a second **ὅτι** and the words **τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ** are introduced, resuming the **ὅτι** and the **ποτέ** of ver. 11. There is no need, therefore, to supply either **ὄντες** or **ἦτε** at this point. **τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σαρκί**: *Gentiles in the flesh.* The article is given to the **ἔθνη**, the *class* to which the readers belong being in view (Win.-Moult., pp. 132, 217). It is not repeated before the **σαρκί**, as the **ἐν σαρκί** makes one idea with the **τὰ ἔθνη** (Win.-Moult., p. 169). The term **σάρξ** also is to be taken literally, not as referring to the former unregenerate life, but (as the subsequent sentences show) in the sense of the *flesh* to which *circumcision* is applicable. They are reminded that they belonged to the class of the Gentiles, their bodies proclaiming their heathen character.—**οἱ λεγόμενοι ἀκροβυστία**: *who are called Uncircumcision.* A further definition of what they were as **ἔθνη**, suggestive of the low regard in which they were held as members of that class. The name *Uncircumcision!*—a name of contempt, was flung at them. The term **ἀκροβυστία**, which is unknown to profane Greek but is used in the LXX, is taken to be an Alexandrian corruption of **ἀκροποσθία**.—**ὑπὸ τῆς λεγομένης περιτομῆς ἐν σαρκὶ χειροποιήτου**: *by that which is called Circumcision, in the flesh, made by hand.* So the RV. Better perhaps "by the so-called Circumcision, performed by hand in the flesh" (Ell.). Wicl. gives "made by hand in flesh". A description of the Jew, given in a tone of depreciation. Hence probably the change from **οἱ λεγόμενοι** to **τῆς λεγομένης περιτομῆς**. This sentence also is introduced with reference to the poverty of the previous condition of these Godless, Christless Gentiles. The point seems to be that the inferiority in which they were held, and which was expressed by the contemptuous name *Uncircumcision*, meant all the more as it was fastened on them by those to whom, while proudly calling themselves the *Circumcision*, the distinction was nothing more than an outward manual act performed on their bodies. The rite when its spiritual significance and use are in view, is spoken of with honour by Paul (Rom. iv. 11). As a mere performance, a barrier between Jew and Gentile, a yoke imposed by the former on the latter, a thing made essential to salvation, he spoke of it in terms of scorn and repudiation.

Ver. 12. **ὅτι ἦτε ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ χωρὶς Χριστοῦ**: *that ye were at that time apart from Christ.* The sentence interrupted by the description of those addressed as **τὰ ἔθνη κ.τ.λ.** is now resumed—*Remember, I say, that ye were.* The **τῷ καιρῷ**, corresponding to the previous **ποτέ**, refers to their pre-Christian days. In such phrases it is usual to insert **ἐν** (Donald., *Greek Gram.*, p. 487), and it is inserted by the TR (following AD[1]FG, etc.). But time *when* is also often enough expressed by the simple dat. (Win.-Moult., pp. 273, 274), and the balance of evidence is largely against the presence of the prep. here. The **χωρὶς Χριστοῦ** is the predicate to **ἦτε**, and is not a defining clause = "being at that time without Christ" (De Wette,

f Acts xxii. 28 only; 2 Macc. iv. 11. λοτριωμένοι τῆς [f] πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ [g] ξένοι τῶν [h] διαθηκῶν τῆς [i] ἐπαγγελίας, ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες καὶ [k] ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ [1].

g Constr., here only; *cf.* Soph., *Œd. Tyr.*, 219, 220, Plato, *Apol.* i. ix. 4; Gal. iv. 24 only. h Acts iii. 25; plur., Rom. i Gal. iv. 23; Heb. iv. 17 al. k Here only.

[1] κοσμ. τουτω FG, Or., etc.

Bleek). It describes their former condition as one in which they had no connection with Christ; in which respect they were in a position sadly inferior to that of the Jews whose attitude was one of hoping and waiting for Christ, the Messiah. Their apartness from Christ, their lack of all relation to Him—this is the first stroke in the dark picture of their former heathen life, and the four to which the eye is directed in the subsequent clauses all follow from that.—**ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰσραήλ**: *alienated from the commonwealth of Israel.* The *alienation* is expressed by **ἀπαλλοτριοῦσθαι,** a strong verb, common enough in classical Greek (at least from Plato's time), corresponding to the OT זוּר (*cf.* Ps. lviii. 4), and used again in Eph. iv. 18; Col. i. 21. It does not necessarily imply a lapse from a former condition of attachment or fellowship, but expresses generally the idea of being a *stranger* as contrasted with one who is *at home* with a person or an object. The term **πολιτεία** has two main senses—a *state* or *commonwealth* (*e.g.*, 2 Macc. iv. 11, viii. 17), and *citizenship* or the rights of a citizen (Acts xxii. 28). The first of these is most in harmony with the theocratic term **τοῦ Ἰσραήλ,** and so it is understood by most. These Ephesians, therefore, had no part in the theocracy, the OT constitution under which God made Himself known to the Jew and entered into relation with him.—**καὶ ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας**: *and strangers from the covenants of the Promise.* The **τῶν διαθηκῶν** is probably the gen. of *separation* or *removal.* That idea is usually expressed by a prep., but with verbs like **ὑποχωρεῖν, διαφέρειν, ἀποστερεῖσθαι,** and with some adjectives, it is also expressed by the simple gen. (Win.-Moult., pp. 243, 244). The word **ξένος,** which has the particular meaning of one who is not a member of a state or city, is used here in the general sense of *foreign* to a thing, having no share in it. The **διαθῆκαι** are the covenants with Abraham and the patriarchs (*cf.* Wisd. xviii. 22; 2 Macc. viii. 15). It is obviously the covenants of Messianic significance that are in view. That the Mosaic Law or the Sinaitic Covenant is not in view seems to follow from the mention of the **ἐπαγγελία**; for that Covenant was not distinctively of the Promise, but is described by Paul as coming in after it and provisionally (Gal. iii. 17-19). The **ἐπαγγελία** is the Promise, the one distinctively so called, the great Messianic Promise given to the fathers of the Hebrew people (Gen. xiii. 15, xv. 18, xvii. 8, etc.). The defining **τῆς ἐπαγγελίας** is attached by some (Rosenmüller, etc.) to the following **ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες.** But the *covenants* and the *promise* are kindred ideas, and make one thought here.—**ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες**: *having no hope.* With participles the subjective negative is much more frequently used than **οὐ.** In cases like the present, where the participle does not belong to the class of those expressing command, purpose, condition or the like, the use of **μή** is due to the *aspect* in which the matter in question presents itself to the writer—to the fact, *e.g.*, that he has a *genus*, not the individual, in view; *cf.* Ell. on 1 Thess. ii. 15, and Win.-Moult., p. 606. The statement here is absolute—**ἐλπίδα,** not **τὴν ἐλπίδα.** It is not only that they had not *the* hope, the Messianic hope which was one of the distinctions of the Israelite, but that they were utterly without hope. Ignorant of the Divine salvation and of Christ in whom it was found, they had nothing to hope for beyond this world. —**καὶ ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ**: *and without God in the world.* The last element in the darkness and misery of their former life. The adj. **ἄθεος,** which is never found in the LXX or in the Apocrypha, and only this once in the NT, in classical Greek means *impious* in the sense of denying or neglecting the gods of the State; but it is also used occasionally in the sense of *knowing* or *worshipping no God* (Æl., V. h., 2, 31), or in that of *abandoned by God* (Soph., *Œd. R.*, 633). Three renderings are possible here—*ignorant* of God, *denying* God, *forsaken* of God. The third is preferred by many (Mey., Ell., etc.), who think that the darkest colour is given to the picture of their old heathen condition by this men-

13. [l] νυνὶ δὲ ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ὑμεῖς οἱ [m] ποτὲ ὄντες [n] μακρὰν [o] ἐγγὺς [l] ἐγενήθητε [p] ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ χριστοῦ. 14. αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν ἡ

l Acts xxii. 1 (xxiv. 13 var. read.); Rom. vi. 22 al(19); Paul only. m Ver. 11 reff. n Luke xv. 20 al.; Acts ii. 39; here and v. 17 only in Paul; Isa. lvii. 19; Dan. ix. 7. o Abs., Luke xix. 11; John xix. 42; Phil. iv. 5. p Luke xxii. 20; Rom. iii. 25, v. 9; Heb. x. 19; Rev. i. 5; v. 9.

[l] εγεν. εγγ. ℵAB 17, 31, 37, etc., Eus., Euth., Dial., Epiph., Ir., Tert., al.; text DEFGKL, most mss., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., al. For αιματι, ονοματι 49.

tion of the fact that they were without the help and protection of God. The first of the three senses, however, seems even more in harmony with the preceding negations. As they were without Christ, and without hope, so were they without God—without the knowledge of the one true and living and thus destitute of any God. So in Gal. iv. 8 Paul speaks of Gentiles like these as *knowing* not God and doing service unto them *which by nature are no gods*. The clause **ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ** is connected by some with the whole preceding description (Koppe, etc.); by others with the two last sentences in the description—the **ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες** and the **ἄθεοι** (Abb.). But it rather makes one idea with the immediately preceding term **ἄθεοι**. It is difficult to say in what particular sense the **κόσμος** is used here—whether in the simple, non-ethical sense, or in the deeper sense which it has in John and also at times in some degree in Paul (1 Cor. i. 21, vi. 2, xi. 32; 2 Cor. vii. 10). Whichever is preferred—whether "without God in the world of men," or "without God in this *evil* world"—an appropriate idea results. But the implied contrast with the previous **πολιτεία τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ** leads most to decide for the latter. The domain of their life was this present evil world, and in it, alienated as it was from God, they had no God.

Ver. 13. **νυνὶ δὲ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ὑμεῖς οἱ ποτε ὄντες μακρὰν ἐγγὺς ἐγενηθητε**: *but now in Christ Jesus ye that aforetime were far off are become nigh*. In classical Greek **νυνί** is used only of *time*, mostly with *present* tenses, rarely with the future, and means *at this very moment*. In the NT it is used mostly of time, but also as a logical particle, bringing a statement to a conclusion, = *rebus sic stantibus, as the case stands* (Rom. vii. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 20, etc.). Here it has the usual temporal meaning—*now* as contrasted with the previous period, **τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ**. The **ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ** is put emphatically first and is to be connected with the **νυνί** (Ell., etc.) rather than with the **ἐγενήθητε**, the point being this—*then* ye were separate from Christ, but *now* ye are in Him, united with Him, and so are become nigh. It is difficult, if not impracticable, to discover in each case a reason for the use of **Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς** instead of the simple **Χριστός**; and the **Ἰησοῦ** indeed is dropped by some ancient authorities (L., Iren., Orig., Tert., etc.). But the double designation is appropriate here—*then* they were without *Christ*, having no part in the Messiah in whom the Jew had hope; *now* they are in living, present, personal fellowship with the Saviour known among men as Christ Jesus. The **μακράν** repeats the idea of distance and separation previously expressed by **ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι** and **ξένοι**. The expression **ἐγγὺς γίνεσθαι**, to *come* or *become near*, which is common enough in profane Greek, occurs only here in the NT. The order of the TR, **ἐγγὺς ἐγενήθητε**, is supported by DFKL, etc.; but **ἐγενήθητε ἐγγύς** is the reading of BℵA, 17, Vulg., Goth., etc., and is adopted by most (LTTrWHRV). For the designation of the Gentiles as "far off" and the use of the phrase "bring nigh" in the sense of making them members of the theocracy, *cf.* Isa. lvii. 19; Dan. ix. 7; and for examples in Jewish literature, see Wetst., *in loc.*; Schöttg., *Horæ Hebr.*, i., 76. The verses which immediately follow refer to the removal of the ancient barrier between Jew and Gentile. The **ἐγενήθητε ἐγγύς**, however, need not be restricted to that. It is in contrast with the whole previous condition of separation from Christ, with all that that meant with regard to the commonwealth of Israel, the covenants, hope, and God. It is probably to be taken, therefore, in the large sense of being brought into the Kingdom of God, made near to God Himself and so brought to hope and privilege.—**ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ**: *in* (or, *by*) *the blood of Christ*. On the import of the phrase "the blood of Christ" see under i. 7 above. The **ἐν** here has much the same sense as the **διὰ** there. They both express *instrumentality*. If there is any difference between them it is that **διὰ** expresses simple, objective, instrumentality, while **ἐν** denotes what Ell.

q=here only; see Rom. v. 1. r Here only. s Matt. xxi. 33; ‖ Mark Luke xiv. 23, epp., here only; Num. xxii. 24. t=John ii. 19; 2 Pet. iii. 10, 11, 12. u Luke xxiii. 12; James iv. 4 al.; Paul only; Gen. iii. 15. v Here only; see Rom. iii. 27, vii. 2, viii. 2.

[illegible]

q εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφότερα ἓν καὶ τὸ r μεσότοιχον τοῦ s φραγμοῦ t λύσας, 15. τὴν u ἔχθραν, ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ, τὸν v νόμον

calls *immanent* instrumentality, the action of the verb being regarded as *existing in the means*. See Ell. on the present passage and on 1 Thess. iv. 18. There is little to be gained, however, by attempting much finesse in such matters.

Ver. 14. **αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν**: *for He is our Peace*. As most commentators notice, the emphasis is on the **αὐτός**—"He and no other". But there is probably more in it than that. The selection of the abstract **εἰρήνη**, instead of the simple **εἰρηνοποιός**, suggests that the point of the **αὐτός** is not only "He *alone*," but "He *in His own person*". It is not only that the peace was made *by* Christ and ranks as His achievement, but that it is so identified with Him that were He away it would also fail,—so dependent on Him that apart from Him we cannot have it. And He is thus for us "*the* Peace" (**ἡ εἰρήνη**), Peace in the absolute sense to the exclusion of all other. *Peace*, the peace of the Messianic age, the peace that is to come by Messiah, is a frequent note in OT prophecy (Isa. ix. 5, 6, lii. 7, liii. 5, lvii. 19; Mic. v. 5; Hag. ii. 9; Zech. ix. 10). Here, as the next sentence shows, the peace especially in view is that between Jew and Gentile. —**ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφότερα ἓν**: *who made both one*. Not "hath made," but "made," with reference to the definite act of His death, as suggested by the **ἐν τῷ αἵματι**. The **ἀμφότερα** is the abstract neuter—the two *parties* or classes. The sing. neut. **ἕν** (= one *thing*, one *organism*) expresses the idea of the *unity*, the new unity which the two long separate and antagonistic parties became; *cf.* the **ἕν** used even of the relation between Christ and God in John x. 16, and for the unity here in view, *cf.* Rom. x. 12; 1 Cor. xii. 13; Gal. iii. 28; Col. iii. 11.—**καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας**: *and broke down the middle wall of the partition*. The former clause began the explanation of how Christ became our Peace. That explanation is continued in this clause and in the following. The **καί**, therefore, is epexegetic = *to wit*, or *in that* (*cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 545). The gen. **φραγμοῦ** is not a mere equivalent to an adject. or a partic., as if = **τὸ μεσότοιχον διαφράσσον** (Grot., Rosenm., etc.), nor is it the gen. of *quality*, = "the middle wall whose character it is to divide"; but either (*a*) the *appos.* gen. or gen. of *identity*, = "the middle wall that is (or, consists in) the partition," or (*b*) the *posses.* gen., = "the wall pertaining to the partition". On the *latter* view of the gen. the **μεσότοιχον** (a word found only this once in the NT and of rare occurrence elsewhere) becomes the more definite and specific term, the **φραγμός** the more general, the former being, indeed, a part of the latter. That is to say, the **φραγμός** is the whole system of things that kept Jew and Gentile apart, and the **μεσότοιχον** is the thing in the system that most conspicuously divided them, and that constituted the "enmity," *viz.*, the Law. It is best, however, to take the terms **μεσότοιχον** and **φραγμός** in the simple, literal sense of *division* and *separation*, which are not explained to be the Law till the **νόμος** is actually introduced in the subsequent clause; and, therefore, the *former* view of the gen. appears to be preferable. It is suggested that what Paul really expresses then is the fact that the legal system, which was meant primarily to protect the Jewish people against the corruption of heathen idolatry, became the bitter root of Jewish exclusiveness in relation to the Gentiles. This is to give the **φραγμός** here the sense of something that fences *in* or *encloses*, which it occasionally has (Soph., *Œd. Tyr.*, 1387). But that is a rare sense, and the idea seems to be simpler. It is doubtful, too, whether Paul had in view here any material partition with which he was familiar. It could scarcely be the veil of the Temple that was rent at the Crucifixion; for that veil did not serve to separate the Gentile from the Jew. It might rather be (as Anselm, Bengel, and many more have thought) the wall or screen that divided the court of the Gentiles from the sanctuary proper, and of which Josephus tells us that it bore an inscription forbidding any Gentile from penetrating further (*Jew. Wars*, v., 5, 2; vi., 2, 4; *Antiq.*, viii., 3, 2; xv., 11, 5). But even this is questionable, and all the more so as the wall was still standing at the time when this was written. For the use of **λύσας** *cf.* John ii. 19.

τῶν [v] ἐντολῶν ἐν [w] δόγμασιν [x] καταργήσας,[1] ἵνα τοὺς δύο [y] κτίσῃ [z] ἐν [w] Luke ii. 1; Acts xvi. 4, xvii. 7; Col. ii. 14
[z] ἑαυτῷ [a] εἰς ἕνα [b] καινὸν[2] [b] ἄνθρωπον, [c] ποιῶν εἰρήνην, 16. καὶ [d] ἀπο-

only; Dan. vi. 9. x Luke xiii. 7, but=(24) Paul only; see Rom. iii. 3 al. y Ver. 10 reff.
z=Here only. a=Matt. xiii. 30, xxvii. 51 ‖ Mark; Rev. xvi. 19; Jud. ix. 43. b Ch. iv. 24 only; see 2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15. c James iii. 18 only; see Matt. v. 9. d Col. i. 20, 21 only.

[1] καταρτισας DE. For εαυτω, αυτω ℵABFP 3, 14, 17, etc., al.$_8$; εαυτω ℵ^{3}DEKLP, most mss., Ath.$_2$, Chr., Thdrt., Dam., Thl., Oec.

[2] κοινον FG.

Ver. 15. **τὴν ἔχθραν**: *to wit the enmity*. Many (Luth., Calv., De Wette, etc.) take this to be a figure for the Mosaic Law. But the **ἔχθρα** is in antithesis to the **εἰρήνη** of ver. 14, and the specification of the Law comes in later. It is better, therefore, to take the **ἔχθρα** here in the abstract sense of *hostile, separating feeling*. But is it the enmity of Jew and Gentile to God (Chrys., Harl., etc.) or the enmity between Jew and Gentile? The statement of the **μεσότοιχον** as a mid-wall between **τὰ ἀμφότερα** decides for the latter. The argument in favour of this view is stronger still when the former view is connected with the idea that the **ἔχθρα** is the Mosaic Law. For the Mosaic Law could not be said to have been the cause of hostile feeling on the part of Gentiles to God.—**ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ**: *in His flesh*. The term **σάρξ** is taken by some (Stier, etc.) in a sense wide enough to cover Christ's incarnation and His entire incarnate life. But, apart from other difficulties, this is inconsistent with the definite mention of His *blood* and His *cross*. The term refers, therefore, to His death, and means His crucified flesh (*cf.* Col. i. 22). The great difficulty here, however, is the connection. Some attach the phrase immediately to **τὴν ἔχθραν** (Chrys., etc.), "the enmity which was in His flesh," as if the idea were "the hatred in the human race generally" or "the national hatred," the hatred in the Jewish people. But this would require **τήν** before **ἐν σαρκί**, and furnishes at best a forced meaning. Most commentators connect it with **καταργήσας**, supposing it to be put emphatically first. So it is taken, *e.g.*, by Meyer, who makes **ἐν σαρκί** begin the new clause. The RV takes the same view, but brings the **ἔχθραν** under the regimen of the **καταργήσας**—"having abolished in His flesh the enmity, *even* the law". There is much to say in support of this, especially in view of the Pauline statements in Rom. iii. 21, x. 14; Gal. iii. 13; Col. ii. 14, etc. On the other hand there is an awkwardness in bringing in the predication *before* the verb, and the parallelism is broken (*cf.* Alf.). It is best, therefore, to attach the **ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ** to the **λύσας** (Calv., Rück., Alf., etc.). The form of the sentence is better kept in this way. The appropriateness of the use of **λύσας** is then seen; for the verb **λύειν** (= *subvert, dissolve*), is equally applicable to the **μεσότοιχον** and to the **ἔχθραν**, the phrase **λύειν ἔχθραν** being common in ordinary Greek. On the other hand **καταργεῖν** is much less applicable to **ἔχθραν**. So the sense is—"who in His crucified flesh (*i.e.*, by His death on the cross) broke down the middle-wall of the partition, to wit the enmity" (*i.e.*, the hostile feeling between Jew and Gentile).—**τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν καταργήσας**: *having abolished* (or, in that He abolished) *the law of commandments* (expressed) *in ordinances*. Further statement of the way in which Christ by His death on the cross removed the separation and the hostile feeling between Jew and Gentile, *viz.*, by abrogating the dividing Law itself. The Law is now introduced, and the term **ὁ νόμος** is to be taken in its full sense, not the *ceremonial* law only, but the Mosaic Law as a whole, according to the stated use of the phrase. This Law is *abolished* in the sense of being rendered *inoperative* (as **καταργεῖν** means), and it is defined as the Law **τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν**. What is the point of the definition? The article, which is in place with the **ἐντολῶν**, is omitted before the **δόγμασιν**, as the latter makes one idea with the former and further is under the regimen of a prep. (*cf.* Win.-Moult., pp. 139, 149, 151, 158). The Law is one of "commandments-in-decrees". What is in view is its character as mandatory, and consisting in a multitude of prescriptions or statutes. It *enjoined*, and it expressed its injunctions in so many decrees, but it did not enable. The Law was made up of **ἐντολαί** and these **ἐντολαί** expressed themselves and operated in the form of **δόγματα**, *ordinances*. The word **δόγμα** in the NT never means anything else than *statute, decree, ordin-*

e Rom. xii. καταλλάξῃ [1] τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν [e]ἑνὶ σώματι τῷ θεῷ [2] [f]διὰ τοῦ
4, 5; 1 Cor. x. 17 σταυροῦ, [g]ἀποκτείνας τὴν [h]ἔχθραν ἐν αὐτῷ [3]· 17. καὶ [i]ἐλθὼν [k]εὐηγ-
f Col. i. 20. γελίσατο [k]εἰρήνην ὑμῖν [4] τοῖς [l]μακρὰν καὶ εἰρήνην [5] τοῖς [m]ἐγγύς,
g=here only. h Rom. viii. 7 reff. i=Matt. ii. 8, 9, 23, iv. 13 al. k Rom. x. 15 only.
l m Ver. 13 reff.

[1] αποκαταλλαξει KLP 72, 80, al.

[2] εν ενι πνευματι προς τον θεον Thdrt.

[3] εν εαυτω FG 115, Lat.-mss.-in.-Jer., Goth., Arm., Lat. Fathers (not Tert., Jer., al.).

[4] υμιν om. 73; ημιν 31, 44, al.$_6$, Eth., Slav.-mss., Thl.-ms. Rec. om. ειρηνην with KL, al., Syr., al., Chr., Thdrt., Tert., Eus., Euth., Dam., etc.; insert ℵABDEFGP 17, 71, 80, It., Vlg., Copt., Eth., Arm., Eus., Procop., Cypr., Hil., all.

[5] εσχομεν ℵ^1.

ance (*cf.* Luke ii. 1; Acts xvi. 4, xvii. 7; Col. ii. 14; in Heb. xi. 23 it is a variant for **διάταγμα**). Hence it cannot have any such sense here as *doctrines, evangelical teaching* (Theod.), *evangelical precepts* (Fritz.), the *faith* (Chrys.). Some taking the **ἐν** as the *instrumental* **ἐν** make it = "having abolished the law by injunctions" (Syr., Vulg., Arab., Grot., Beng., etc.). But the NT uniformly speaks of the abrogation of the condemning law as being effected by Christ's death, never by His *teaching*, or by evangelical *precepts*. Another turn is given to the sentence by taking **ἐν** in the sense of "in respect of," "on the side of" (Harl.), as if the idea were that the abrogation of the Law was limited to its mandatory side,—to the *orders* contained in it. But this would require **τοῖς** before the **δόγμασιν**; nor is it the way of the NT to speak of the Mosaic Law as done away by Christ only on one side.—**ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ ἐν ἑαυτῷ εἰς ἕνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον**: *that He might create in Himself the two into one new man.* Statement of the object of the **καταργεῖν**. The masc. **δύο** is introduced now, instead of the **ἀμφότερα**, with a view to the **ἄνθρωπον**. One *man* was to be made out of the two *men*. The **κτίσῃ** is better rendered *create* with the RV than *make* with the AV. A new *creation* is in view. For **ἐν ἑαυτῷ** of the TR (with DKLℵ^3, etc.) **αὐτῷ** is to be preferred as the reading of ℵ^{1}BAF, etc. (LTTrRV); WH gives **αὑτῷ**. In either case the sense is "in Himself"; not "by it" (Grot.) as if the reference were to Christ's *doctrine*, nor "through Himself" as if it were **δι' αὐτοῦ**. The new creation and the new union have their ground and principle *in* Christ. What was contemplated, too, was not simply the making of *one man* (**ἕνα ἄνθρωπον**) where formerly there were two, but the making of *one new* (**καινὸν**) *man*. The result was not that, though the separation between them was removed, the Jew still remained Jew and the Gentile still Gentile. It was something new, the old distinctions between Jew and Gentile being lost in a third order of "man"—the Christian man.—**ποιῶν εἰρήνην**: *making peace.* The **εἰρήνη** is still peace between the estranged Jew and Gentile, and the **ποιῶν** (*pres.*, not *aor.*) belongs to the object expressed by the **ἵνα**. In carrying out that purpose He was to make peace the one with the other.

Ver. 16. **καὶ ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους**: *and that He might reconcile them both.* Further statement of object, the **καί** continuing and extending it. Only at this point is the prior and larger idea of the reconciliation *to God* introduced, and even now it is in connection with the idea of the reconciliation of Jew and Gentile. For **τοὺς δύο** we now have **τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους**, not "the two" but "both of them together," *unity* being the aspect in which they are now presented. The **ἀπο-** in such compounds has sometimes simply an intensive meaning (**ἀποθαρρεῖν, ἀποθαυμάζειν, ἀποκαραδοκεῖν, ἀπεκδέχεσθαι,** etc.); sometimes, though less frequently, the sense of *again* (**ἀποδίδωμι, ἀποκαθίστημι, ἀποκατορθόω, ἀποκαταλαμβάνω**). It is doubtful which is the force of the **ἀπο-** here. In the context, it is true, so far as the relations of Jew and Gentile to each other are dealt with, we have simply the idea of a state of separation into two hostile camps giving place to a state of unity. But in the present clause the larger truth of a reconciliation *to God* is in view, and this favours the idea of a *restoration* to a condition which had been lost. The form **ἀποκαταλλάσσειν** occurs in the NT only here and in Col. i. 20, 21. In the LXX and once in the NT (Matt. v. 24) we have also **διαλλάττεσθαι.** But

the two appear to be practically indistinguishable. As derivatives of **ἀλλάσσειν** they both convey the idea of a change, not primarily in *feeling* (which is expressed by **ἱλάσκεσθαι** and its compounds), but in *relation*, and in *mutual* relation, on the side of God to man and on the side of man to God (*cf.* Rom. v. 9-11; 2 Cor. v. 18-20).—**ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ**: *in one body through the cross.* This cannot refer to *Christ's* body (Chrys., Beng., Harl., Hofm.), as if the point were either the reconciliation of *two* parties by *one body*, or the *one* offering of Christ that needed no repetition (Heb. vii. 27, etc.), or, again, the *one* sacrifice as contrasted with the multitude of the Levitical oblations. These are ideas alien to the context, and they are the less appropriate because Christ Himself is the *subject* of the **ἀποκαταλλάξῃ**. The reference is to the Jews and Gentiles now making one body; *cf.* the **ἓν σῶμα** in 1 Cor. x. 17; Eph. iv. 4; and especially in Col. iii. 15. His object was to bring the two long-sundered and antagonistic parties as one whole, one great body, into right relation to God by His cross. The **διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ** belongs rather to the **ἀποκαταλλάξῃ** than to the following **ἀποκτείνας** (von Soden). —**ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν αὐτῷ**: *having slain the enmity thereby.* For **ἐν αὐτῷ** there is a variant reading **ἐν ἑαυτῷ**, slenderly supported (F 115, etc.); and some propose **ἐν αὑτῷ** (von Soden). But this **ἐν αὐτῷ** refers to the **σταυροῦ**, and the idea is not that Christ slew the enmity in Himself, but that He did it "by the cross," or, as some take it (Alf., etc.), "on the cross". The **ἔχθρα** here, again, is not the *Law* itself, nor the enmity of Jew and Gentile *to God* (though most take it so), but rather the **ἔχθρα** previously mentioned—the enmity between Jew and Gentile. Further, the **ἀποκτείνας** which *might* denote an action coincident with that denoted by the main verb, or might define the way in which the latter was made good, seems to have its proper sense of *priority*—"after He had killed". He had first to kill this enmity between the two before He could bring them both into right relations to God in the way indicated, *viz.*, in one body, as one great, united whole.

Ver. 17. **καὶ ἐλθὼν εὐηγγελίσατο εἰρήνην ὑμῖν τοῖς μακρὰν καὶ εἰρήνην τοῖς ἐγγύς**: *and He came and preached peace to you that were far off, and peace to them that were nigh.* The TR reads simply **καὶ τοῖς ἐγγύς** (with KL, the mass of cursives, the Syr., etc.). The primary uncials and other important authorities (B ℵ AD 17, Vulg., etc.) insert **εἰρήνην** (so LTTrWHRV). The repetition has rhetorical force. The **καί**, again, does not merely connect this statement with the former. It adds to the thought. Not only did Christ effect the reconciliation, but He also came and preached the glad tidings of it, and that not to one class but to both. The aor. partic. has probably its proper force of *priority* in relation to the def. aor. **εὐηγγελίσατο**. The *coming* in question preceded the preaching. The best rendering, therefore, will be neither "coming" (Eadie), nor "came and preached" (AV and RV), but "having come" (Mey., Ell., etc.). But to what *coming* does the **ἐλθών** refer? Not to the *incarnation* (Chrys., Anselm, Harl., etc.); for the preceding sentences, which speak of His blood and of the peace effected through His cross, make it clear that the time in view is not before the crucifixion but *after* it. Nor can the reference well be to the event of His Resurrection, nor even to His own direct teaching during the forty days (Beng.). What is in view is rather His coming in His Spirit (*cf.* John xiv. 18; Acts xxvi. 23, etc.). That the idea of His spiritual Advent in the Holy Ghost which is prominent in the Fourth Gospel is not a Johannine idea only, but one entirely consistent with Paul's teaching, appears from the Pauline doctrine of the dwelling of Christ Himself or His Spirit in the believer (Rom. viii. 9, 10; 2 Cor. xii. 17, xiii. 5; Gal. ii. 20); as also from the relation of the Holy Ghost to the Apostle's preaching (Rom. xv. 18), etc. The preaching meant by the **εὐηγγελίσατο**, therefore, is Christ's mediate preaching through His Apostles and others, especially that declaration of His truth which made these Gentiles Christians. Those "afar off" are mentioned first, as the Gentiles in the persons of these Ephesians and other Asiatics were the writer's immediate concern.

Ver. 18. **ὅτι δι' αὐτοῦ ἔχομεν τὴν προσαγωγὴν οἱ ἀμφότεροι ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα**: *for through Him we both have our access in one Spirit unto the Father.* Some take **ὅτι** as = *that*, the mention of the common access being taken as the *contents* of the **εὐηγγελίσατο**. But the subject of the preaching has already been given, *viz.*, **εἰρήνη**. Hence **ὅτι** = *for*, and the verse is a confirmation of the previous statement in the form of an appeal to the experience of those addressed. The fact that we, both of us, are now brought to God

n Rom. v. 2; 18. ὅτι δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἔχομεν[1] τὴν [n]προσαγωγὴν οἱ ἀμφότεροι ἐν [o]ἑνὶ
ch. iii. 12 only. πνεύματι πρὸς τὸν [p]πατέρα. 19. [q]ἄρα οὖν[2] οὐκέτι ἐστὲ [r]ξένοι καὶ
o Phil. i. 27; ch. iv. [s]πάροικοι, ἀλλ᾽ ἐστὲ[3] [t]συμπολῖται τῶν [u]ἁγίων καὶ [v]οἰκεῖοι τοῦ θεοῦ,
3, 4.
p=1 Cor. viii. 6; 1 Pet. i. 17; John, passim. q Rom. v. 18, vii. 3, viii. 12, ix. 16, 18; Gal. vi. 10
al³.; Paul only. r=Matt. xx. 5, 35 al.; Acts xvii. 21; Heb. xi. 13; 3 John 5; Ruth. ii. 10.
s Acts vii. 6, 29; 1 Pet. ii. 11 only; Gen. xxiii. 4. t Here only; Jos., *Antt.*, xix., 2, 2. u Ch. i.
1 reff. v=Gal. vi. 10; 1 Tim. v. 8 only; Isa. iii. 6.

[1] εσχομεν ℵ[1]. [2] Omit ουν FG., Or.

[3] Rec. om. εστε with D[3]EKL, Syr., Cop., Arm., Orig., Bas., Euth., etc.; insert ℵABCD[1]EFG 31, 71-3, It., Vlg., Goth., Bas., Lat. Fathers.

through Him is a witness to the truth of what I have just said, *viz.*, that Christ came and preached peace to both. The privilege referred to is a present and continuing privilege (**ἔχομεν,** not **ἐσχήκαμεν** as in Rom. v. 2)—one to which effect is being given now, *viz.*, **τὴν προσαγωγήν,** "the introduction," or "*our* introduction". This noun denotes, properly speaking, the *act of bringing to one*, and then the *approach* or *access* (Herod., ii., 58; Xen., *Cyr.*, vii., 5, 45). It is urged by some (Mey., Ell., etc.) that both here and in Rom. v. 2 it has the primary *trans.* sense, and denotes the privilege of being *brought* to God or *introduced* to Him. Christ would thus be presented in the character of "Bringer," perhaps with some allusion to the office of the **προσαγωγεύς** through whom in Oriental courts one was brought into the royal presence. But the difference in idea between *access* (**πρόσοδος**) and "admission" (Ell.) or "bringing" (**προσαγωγή**) is slight, and there seems sufficient justification for the *intrans.* sense. The **ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι,** which is strangely taken by some (Anselm, Rosenm.) as = **ὁμοθυμαδόν,** "with one mind," obviously refers to the Holy Ghost. That is made clear both by the mention of the *coming* and *preaching* in the Spirit, and by the reference both to *Christ* and to the *Father*. The **ἐν** is not = *by*, but *in*, with reference to the *element* in which alone we have the access. As that right is ours only *through* Christ (**δι᾽ αὐτοῦ**), so it is made ours in actual experience only *in* the Spirit, and Jew and Gentile have it alike because it is one and the same Spirit that works in both. So both have continuous access to God from whom once they were far removed, to Him, too, in the benign character of the *Father* (**τὸν πατέρα**) whom they can approach without fear.

Ver. 19. **ἄρα οὖν οὐκέτι ἐστὲ ξένοι καὶ πάροικοι**: *So then ye are no more strangers and sojourners.* At this point Paul brings to their conclusion the statements made in vv. 14-18, and draws from them the natural, comforting inference. The conclusive **ἄρα** is one of Paul's favourable particles. In his writings and in the NT generally it is sometimes placed second in the sentence, and sometimes (contrary to classical use) first. The combination **ἄρα οὖν** is peculiar to Paul, and takes the first place in the sentence. In this form it has less of the *ratiocinative* force and more of the *collective; cf.* Buttm., *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 371; Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 273. **ξένοι καὶ πάροικοι,** a comprehensive expression, including "all who, whether by natural and territorial demarcation, or by the absence of civic privileges, were not citizens" (Ell.). The term **πάροικος** in ordinary Greek means a *neighbour*. In the LXX it represents תּוֹשָׁב (nine times) or גֵּר (eleven times). Here it stands for the classical **μέτοικος,** which never occurs in the NT, is found only once in the LXX (Jer. xx. 3) and means one who comes from one country or city and settles in another, but does not rank as a **πολίτης** or **ἀστός** having the right of citizenship (*cf.* Acts vii. 6, 29; 1 Pet. ii. 11). There is no reference to *proselytes* in particular (Baumg.).—**ἀλλὰ συμπολῖται τῶν ἁγίων**: *but fellow-citizens with the saints.* Most critical editors (LTTrWHRV) insert **ἐστέ** after **ἀλλά,** on the authority of BℵACD, etc. The form **συνπολῖται** is preferred by Tisch., WH, Ell., Alf., etc. The word belongs mostly to late Greek. The **ἁγίων** is not to be restricted to *Jews*, the *patriarchs*, or *OT believers*, but is a comprehensive name for *Christians*, the whole community of believers in Christ without distinction of Jew and Gentile. The Jewish people were once "the saints" of God, and Gentiles stood outside having no part in their **πολιτεία.** Now all Gentile believers, like these Ephesians, form part of that greater "Israel of God (Gal. vi. 16) which con-

20. [w] ἐποικοδομηθέντες ἐπὶ τῷ [x] θεμελίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν,[1] ὄντος [y] ἀκρογωνιαίου[2] αὐτοῦ[3] Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ,[4] 21. ἐν ᾧ πᾶσα[5] w Acts xx. 32 (rec.); 1 Cor. iii. 10, etc.;

Col. ii. 7; Jude 20 only. x=Rom. xv. 20; 1 Cor. iii. 10, 11; 2 Tim. ii. 19; Heb. vi. 1.
y 1 Pet. ii. 6 only; Isa. xxviii. 16.

[1] κ. προφ. om. 4[1], Marcion-in. Tert. [2] Insert λιθου DEFG, Orig., Eus., Chr.

[3] Omit αυτου ℵ*, Copt., Orig., Victorin.

[4] Rec. Ιησ. Χρ. with CDEFGKLP, etc., d, e, g, Syr., Ps.-Just. Orig.$_1$, Eus., Euth., Thdrt., Chr., Victorin, Jer. Ez. 40, Is. 50; Χριστου Ιησου ℵ*AB 17, 39, 47, al., Vlg., Goth., Copt., Orig.$_2$, Thl., Ambrst., Jer. Ez. 28, Aug., oft. all.

[5] Rec. after πασα insert η with ℵ[1]ACP, Arm, Orig., Euth., Bas., Chr., Thdrt., etc.; text ℵ*BDEFGKL, most mss., Clem., Orig., Bas., etc.

sists of all Christians, and share in all the rights of such.—**καὶ οἰκεῖοι τοῦ Θεοῦ**: *and of the household of God.* So in Gal. vi. 10, **πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους τῆς πίστεως.** In Greek writers of the later period **οἰκεῖος** is used frequently with the gens. of abstract nouns (**οἰκεῖοι φιλοσοφίας, ὀλιγαρχίας**, etc.) in the general sense of one *closely connected* with philosophy, etc., but without any specific reference either to the *house* of God, or to the **οἰκεῖοι** as forming one *family*. With the present case, however, it is different. The phrase **οἰκεῖοι Θεοῦ** naturally suggests the idea of members of God's *household* or *family* (Mey.); *cf.* 1 Tim. iii. 15; Heb. iii. 2, 5, 6, x. 21; 1 Pet. iv. 17.

Ver. 20. **ἐποικοδομηθέντες ἐπὶ τῷ θεμελίῳ**: *being built upon the foundation.* From the idea of the *house* or *household* of God contained in the **οἰκεῖοι** Paul passes by an easy transition to that of the *building* of the spiritual **οἶκος.** The **ἐπι-** in the comp. verb probably expresses the notion of building *up*; the second **ἐπί** with the dative **θεμελίῳ**, that of *resting on* the foundation—which also might have been expressed by the gen. The forms **ὁ θεμέλιος** and **τὸ θεμέλιον** both occur, the former much more frequently than the latter in Greek literature generally. The latter, however, is found frequently in the LXX, and at least once quite unmistakably in the NT (Acts xvi. 26).—**τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν**: *of the Apostles and Prophets.* The omission of **τῶν** before **προφητῶν** does not necessarily identify the Apostles and Prophets as one and the same persons (Harl.); *cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 162. It indicates, however, that they both belong to the same *class*. The *gen.* is variously understood as (1) the gen. of *apposition* = the foundation which *is* or *consists in* the Apostles; (2) the gen. of *originating cause* = the foundation *laid by* them; (3) the *possess.* gen. = "the Apostles' foundation"—in the sense of that on which they built (Anselm, Beza, etc.), or as = that on which they also were built (Alf.). The choice seems to be between (1) and (2). The former has been the view of many from Chrys. down to Von Soden and Abbott, and is favoured so far by Rev. xxi. 14. But the second has the suffrages of the majority of modern exegetes (Rück., Harl., Bleek, Mey., Ell., etc.). It is more in accordance with 1 Cor. iii. 10 (although it is the worth of teachers that is immediately in view there), and more especially with Rom. xv. 20, where the *Gospel* as preached by Paul appears to be the "foundation". Here, therefore, it seems best on the whole to understand the Gospel of Christ as preached by the Apostles to be the "foundation" on which their converts were built up into the spiritual house. But who are these **προφῆται**? The OT prophets, say many (Chrys., Theod., Jer., Calv., Rück., etc.)—a view certainly favoured by the use made of the writings of these prophets in the NT, and by the view given of them as "evangelists before the time" (Moule); *cf.* Luke xxiv. 25; Acts iii. 18, 21, 24, x. 43; Rom. xvi. 26. But the natural order in that case would have been "Prophets and Apostles," and the previous statements referred clearly to *Christian* times—to the preaching after Christ's death. Hence the **προφῆται** are to be understood as the *Christian* prophets, of whom large mention is made in the Book of Acts and the Epistles—the NT prophets who in this same Epistle (iii. 5) are designated as *Christ's* prophets and are named (iv. 11) among the gifts of the ascended Lord to His Church. The frequency with which they are referred to (Acts xi. 28, xv. 32; 1 Cor. xiv., etc.) and the place assigned to them next to the Apostles (Eph. iv. 11) show the prominent position they had in the primitive Church. The

z=Matt. xxiv. 1 ‖ Mark; 1 Cor. iii. 9; 2 Cor. v. 1.

[z] οἰκοδομὴ [a] συναρμολογουμένη [b] αὔξει [b] εἰς ναὸν ἅγιον [c] ἐν κυρίῳ, 22. ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς [d] συνοικοδομεῖσθε [e] εἰς [f] κατοικητήριον τοῦ θεοῦ [1] [g] ἐν πνεύματι.

a Ch. iv. 16 only. b Ch. iv. 15; Col. i. 10; 2 Thess. i. 3 reff. c Rom. xvi. 11, 12 al. fr.; Paul only. d Here only. e=Matt. x. 18 al. fr. f Rev. xviii. 2 only; Ps. lxxv. 2.
g (Rom. ix. 1); ch. iii. 5, v. 18; vi. 18; Col. i. 8; 1 Pet. i. 12; Jude 20.

[1] For τ. θεου, τ. Χριστου B.

statements made regarding them in the early non-canonical literature (*The Teaching of the Twelve*, Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, the *Shepherd of Hermas*, etc.) show how they continued to exist and work beyond the Apostolic Age, and help us to distinguish their ministry as that essentially of teachers and exhorters, whether itinerant or resident, from the essentially *missionary* ministry of the Apostles. Further the association of these *prophets* with the *Apostles* suggests that the latter term is not to be restricted here to the Twelve, but is to be taken as including *all* those to whom the name "Apostle" is given in the NT.—**ὄντος ἀκρογωνιαίου αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ**: *Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone.* A few documents, including א[1], omit **Ἰησοῦ**. The **Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ** of the TR is supported by such authorities as CDFKL. The best reading, however, is **Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ**, "Christ Jesus," which is found in BA א-corr., 17, Vulg., Copt., Goth., etc., and is adopted by LTTrWHRV. The word **ἀκρογωνιαῖος** (*cf.* the אֶבֶן כִּנָּה of Isa. xxviii. 16) is peculiar to biblical and ecclesiastical Greek, and is applied to Christ also in 1 Pet. ii. 6. It denotes the stone placed at the extreme corner, so as to bind the other stones in the building together—the most important stone in the structure, the one on which its stability depended. The **αὐτοῦ** refers to **Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ**, not to the **ἀκρογωνιαίου**, nor to the **θεμελίῳ** (Beng.), the point being that to Christ Himself and none other the building owes its existence, its strength and its increase. He Himself, and neither Apostle nor Prophet, is at once the ultimate foundation (1 Cor. iii. 11) and the Head-stone of the Corner. Some have supposed that, the **ἀκρογωνιαῖος** being the stone inserted between two others to give strength and cohesion to the whole, there is a reference in the phrase to the union of Jew and Gentile. But this is to push the figure too far.

Ver. 21. **ἐν ᾧ πᾶσα ἡ οἰκοδομὴ συναρμολογουμένη αὔξει εἰς ναὸν ἅγιον ἐν Κυρίῳ**: *in whom each several building* (RV text; "every building," RV marg.), *fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord.* The relative refers naturally to the nearest subject, what is also the leading subject, **Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ**, not to the **ἀκρογωνιαίου**, far less to the remoter **θεμελίῳ**; the **ἐν** also has its full sense of *in*, not *by* or *on*. That is to say, it is *in Christ Jesus*, and only by connection with Him, that the **οἰκοδομή** is what it is here declared to be. The word **οἰκοδομή** appears to be confined to late Greek, no *certain* instance of it having been found in classical Greek. It occurs in Diod., Philo, Plut., Joseph., the LXX, Macc., etc. It is used both for **οἰκοδόμησις** and **οἰκοδόμημα**. In the NT it has sometimes the literal sense of **οἰκοδόμημα** (*e.g.*, Matt. xxiv. 1; Mark xiii. 1; 2 Cor. v. 1); and sometimes the figurative sense of *edification* (Rom xiv. 19, xv. 2; 2 Cor. xiii. 10; Eph. iv. 29), or, as here, that of a *body of Christian believers*. The question of the text here is important. There is considerable support for **πᾶσα ἡ οἰκοδομή** (א[3]ACP, Arm., etc.), and it is conceivable that itacism might have caused the omission of the **ἡ**. But diplomatic evidence is decidedly in favour of **πᾶσα οἰκοδομή** (Bא*DGKL, etc.). Adopting this reading (with LTTrWHRV) we have to ask whether the phrase is to be rendered *the whole building* or *every building*. The former rendering is certainly the one that first suggests itself, while the latter seems at first difficult to relate to the context. The former is defended as legitimate by some weighty authorities; *e.g.*, Winer, on the ground that the subject is "the Church of Christ as a whole," and Ellicott, who takes it to be a case of grammatical laxity. But the distinction between **πᾶς** with the article and **πᾶς** without it is so well maintained in the NT that only an absolutely intolerable sense can justify us in departing from it. The only exceptions to the general rule appear to be those that hold good also for ordinary Greek—in general and unqualified statements, with proper names, and with nouns which have acquired so stated a meaning that

they can drop the article, etc. (*cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 138, and especially Buttm., *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, pp. 119, 120; Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, pp. 161, 162). The present instance does not come within the scope of these exceptions. It is not like **πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραήλ** (Acts ii. 36), nor is it really analogous even to such cases as the **πᾶσα γῆ** of Thucyd., ii., 43, or the **πᾶσα ἐπιστολή** of Ignat., *Eph.*, 12. Hence the rendering here must be "every building" or "every several building". The present participle **συναρμολογουμένη** (the verb occurs in the NT only here and in iv. 16, and corresponds to the classical **συναρμόζειν**) describes the joining together as a process now going on. The pres. **αὔξει** (a form occurring in the NT only here and in Col. ii. 19, but common in Soph., Thucyd., Pind., etc.) in like manner expresses what is happening now, or, it may be, what is *normal*. The phrase **νάον ἅγιον** is sufficiently rendered "*a* holy temple" or "sanctuary". Some (*e.g.*, Mey.), supposing that Paul has the Jewish temple in view and means to say that the Christian Church is now the true Temple of God, the house made His own sanctuary by His dwelling in it, would render it "*the* holy temple". The **ἐν Κυρίῳ** is connected by some (Harl., etc.) immediately with **ἅγιον**, = a temple that is holy as being in the Lord; by others with **ναὸν ἅγιον** (Ell.); by others with **αὔξει** (Mey.). But it really qualifies the whole statement of the *joining* and *growing*. All this is in the Lord, *i.e.*, *in Christ*, as both the context and the general NT application of **Κύριος** show. The sense of the whole, therefore, is this—in Christ the Lord every several building that goes to make up the ideal Temple of God, every Christian community, the one now addressed not less than others, is at present being surely framed and fitted together, and is growing and harmoniously developing so that it may form part of the great mystical Body of Christ, the vast spiritual fellowship of believers which is God's true Temple.

Ver. 22. **ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς συνοικοδομεῖσθε εἰς κατοικητήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν πνεύματι**: *in whom ye also are being built together into a habitation of God in the Spirit.* The relative refers again, as in ver. 21, to *Christ*, the **Κυρίῳ** just named, not to the **ναόν**. The **καί** (= *also*, not *even*) points to the dignity of the present position—"the exalted nature of the association in which the Ephesians shared" (Ell.). The **συνοικοδομεῖσθε** is not imper. (Calv.), but indic., the burden of the whole section being what was done for the readers and what was made of them. The **συν-** in the comp. verb might convey the idea of being built together with others; but, in view of the force of the **συναρμολογουμένη** it is rather to be understood as denoting the compact connection of one part with another, the orderly conjunction and co-ordination of all the various parts of the **οἰκοδομή** (Mey., Ell.); *cf.* the **συνέκλεισεν** in Gal. iii. 2. **κατοικητήριον** is best translated "habitation". Some draw a distinction between the **ναόν** as the whole Church and the **κατοικητήριον** as the individual Christians (Harl.). But the latter phrase simply expresses in another form the same idea as the former. The **κατοικητήριον** being that *of God* (**τοῦ Θεοῦ**), belonging to Him, inhabited by Him, is the same as the **ναός**. The **ἐν πνεύματι** is not to be taken as = "in a spiritual manner," as if in contrast with **ἐν σαρκί**; nor as making with the noun the idea of "a spiritual house"; but as = *in the Holy Spirit*, the anarthrous **πνεῦμα** having often that sense and the similar **ἐν Κυρίῳ** suggesting it. Nor should the **ἐν** be rendered "through" (AV) or "by" (Mey.). It is true that the *instrumental* use of **ἐν** gives a thoroughly good sense, *viz.*, that we are built together in Christ by the agency of the Holy Spirit—in respect of His dwelling and operating in us. But the idea is rather that of *in* the Spirit as the *element* of the life or the *condition* of the process. The phrase may be connected immediately with the **κατοικητήριον** as if = "a habitation of God realised in the Spirit," or it may be construed as a tertiary predication (Ell.) = "and it is in the Spirit". But it is best taken to qualify the whole statement of the **συνοικοδομεῖσθε**, = "in Christ as the ground and principle of all ye too are being built together into a habitation of God, and it is by your being in the Spirit that this is taking effect". Union with Christ, life in the Spirit—this explained what they were; this meant that they, as well as other Christian bodies, were being built up so as to be a habitation of God.

CHAPTER III. VV. 1-13. These verses make a paragraph by themselves. Their main subject is the call of the Gentiles and Paul's Apostolic vocation in relation thereto. He reminds his readers of the mystery of that call, its revelation to the Apostles and prophets, his own destination to the ministry of preaching among the Gentiles, and the grace given him to make known the Divine dispensation

a Luke vii. 47; Gal. iii. 19; ver. 14; Tit. i. 5; 1 John iii. 12; Jude 16 only; Prov. xvii. 17. b Acts xxiii. 18; 2 Tim. i. 8; Philem. i. 9; Heb. xiii. 3; Zech. ix. 12. c=Col. i. 23; ch. v. 21; 2 Cor. v. 3; Gal. iii. 4; Paul only. d Ch. i. 15 reff. e=1 Cor. ix. 17.

III. 1. Τούτου [a]χάριν ἐγὼ Παῦλος ὁ [b]δέσμιος τοῦ χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ[1] ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν τῶν ἐθνῶν,[2] 2. [c]εἴγε [d]ἠκούσατε τὴν [e]οἰκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος

[1] For χριστ., κυριου C; ιησ. om. ℵDFG 61, Eth., Victorin.; ιησ. χρ. 115, lect. 1, Syr., Arm., Chr., Cyr., Theophyl., Jer., Ambr., etc.

[2] After εθν. add πρεσβευω DE 10, Slav., Ambrst.-comm.; κεκαυχημαι 71, 122, 219.

that opened the Church to those who were not of Israel. This with the view that they should not misunderstand his present position or be discouraged by it.

Ver. 1. **τούτου χάριν ἐγὼ Παῦλος ὁ δέσμιος τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ**: *for this cause I Paul, the prisoner of Christ Jesus.* The **τούτου χάριν** is referred by some (Mey., etc.) to the immediately preceding sentence; the fact that they are destined to make a habitation of God, and are being built together with a view to that end, being Paul's reason for pleading with them and praying for them. It is best referred, however, to the purport of the whole statement just brought to its conclusion; the fact that they are now what God's grace has made them and are meant by Him to form a spiritual habitation for Himself, being His reason for what He urges on them and what He does for them. **ἐγὼ Παῦλος,** a solemn and emphatic designation of the writer by himself, expressive rather of his personal interest in them than the consciousness of his authority (Mey.). For similar occurrences of the emphatic personal designation, with different shades of meaning, see 2 Cor. x. 1; Gal. v. 2; Col. i. 23; Philem. 19. The article with the **δέσμιος** expresses simply the *character* in which Paul appears at present or the *class* to which he belongs (*cf.* **Τιμόθεος ὁ ἀδελφός,** Philem. 1); not his *pre-eminence* among the Lord's prisoners, as if it = the prisoner *par excellence* (Mey.)—a claim surely which would neither be like Paul nor in harmony with the thought of the paragraph. The gen. **Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ** is probably that of *originating cause*—one who has been made a prisoner by Christ; *cf.* 2 Tim. i. 8; Philem. 9, as also Eph. iv. 1. The **Ἰησοῦ** is omitted by Tisch. on the authority of such MSS. as ℵ*D*G; but it is rightly retained by most as found in B ℵ-corr. AC D[2,3], Vulg., etc.—**ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν τῶν ἐθνων**: *on behalf of you the Gentiles.* Paul was called specially to be a minister of Christ to the Gentiles (Acts xxi. 21, 28, xxii. 21), and his preaching Christ as for the Gentiles equally with the Jews provoked that enmity of the Jews which led to his imprisonment. It was thus for the Gentiles that he was a prisoner; and there is probably also the further thought in the **ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν** that Paul's imprisonment was to be for their good, helpful to their Christian life. For the idea with which the paragraph closes is that his afflictions were their *glory* (ver. 13). But what of the construction and connection here? The simplest adjustment is to insert **εἰμί** after **ὁ δέσμιος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ**: "I Paul am the prisoner," etc. So the Syr., Chrys., Mey. and others. But this takes the point from the **ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν** and makes Paul assert and exalt himself as a sufferer in a way unlike him. It is best to take it as a broken construction, the statement with which Paul begins being, as in so many other cases, diverted into a different channel by the introduction of some subsidiary remark. Here he is turned off from what he meant to say by the polite reference in the **εἴγε** clause. Where then have we the resumption? Not at chap. iv. 1 (with the AV, Mich., Winer, etc.), for chap. iii. is not part of a parenthesis, but a paragraph complete within itself; nor at ver. 13, which is of too limited scope and fails to meet the full force of the **τούτου χάριν**; but at ver. 14, where the **τούτου χάριν** is repeated.

Ver. 2. **εἴγε ἠκούσατε τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς**: *if so be that ye did hear of the dispensation of the grace of God that was given me to you-ward.* The comp. particle **εἴγε,** or **εἴ γε** (according to LTrWH), makes a supposition which is taken for granted, = "if, indeed, as I may assume". Whether the certainty of the assumption is in the particle itself or is derived from the context is still debated among grammarians. Some hold that in this case as in others the **γέ** simply strengthens the force of the simple particle, while others think that this is its significance, if not in every instance, at least in a considerable number of occurrences; *cf.* Mey. and Ell., *in loc.;* Win.-Moult., p. 561; Bäumlein, *Partikeln,* p. 64. Here it

τοῦ θεοῦ [1] τῆς δοθείσης μοι [f] εἰς ὑμᾶς, 3. ὅτι [2] [g] κατὰ [g] ἀποκάλυψιν [h] ἐγνωρίσθη [3] μοι τὸ [i] μυστήριον, καθὼς [k] προέγραψα ἐν [l] ὀλίγῳ, 4. [m] πρὸς ὃ δύνασθε [n] ἀναγινώσκοντες [o] νοῆσαι τὴν [p] σύνεσίν μου [q] ἐν τῷ [r] [s] [t]

f=ch. i. 19 reff. g (Rom. xvi. 25); Gal. ii. 2 only. h i Ch. i. 9 reff. i k=here only; Rom. xv. 4; Gal. iii. 1; Jude 4 only; 1 Macc. x. 36. l=here only; Acts xxvi. 28, 29; see 1 Pet. v. 12. m=Luke xii. 47; 2 Cor. v. 10; Gal. ii. 14. n Matt. xii. 3; 2 Cor. i. 13. o Matt. xxiv. 15; Rom. i. 20; 1 Tim. i. 7; 2 Tim. ii. 7. p=Luke ii. 47; 1 Cor. i. 9; Col. i. 9, ii. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 7. q (Ch. i. 15); 2 Chron. xxxiv. 12; Neh. xiii. 7; 3 Esdr. i. 33.

[1] **τ. θεου** inserted *before* **της χαριτος** D*D[3]EFG, d, e, g, Goth.; for **του θεου, του Χριστου** P; **αυτου** A.

[2] **οτι** om. BFG, d, e, Victorin., Ambrst., etc.

[3] **εγνωρισε** D[3]EKL, Eth., Dam., Theophyl., Oec., etc.; **εγνωρισθη** ℵABCD*FGP 6, 10, 17, 23, 31, 67, 73, 80, 137, 177, Vulg., Syr., Arm., Goth., Cop., Bas.

introduces a polite reminder of what these Ephesians certainly had heard—"a gentle appeal, expressed in a hypothetical form, and conveying the hope that his words had not been quite forgotten" (Ell.). On **οἰκονομίαν**, which means the *dispensation*, the *arrangement made* in the matter of something, not "the apostolic office" (Wiesel.), see under i. 10. The **τῆς χάριτος** is the gen. *objecti* or that of "the point of view" (Ell.) = the arrangement or disposition *in respect of* the grace of God. The **χάρις** itself is not the *apostolic office* (Est.), but the gift of grace that selected Paul and qualified him for that office; and so it (not the **οἰκονομία**, but the **χάρις**) is described as **δοθείσης**, *given*. The **εἰς ὑμᾶς**, admirably rendered by the AV "to you-ward," denotes the "ethical direction" (Ell.) of the gift of grace—the fact that it was bestowed on Paul not for his own sake, but with a view to their position.

Ver. 3. **ὅτι κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν ἐγνώρισέ μοι τὸ μυστήριον**: *how that by way of revelation he made known* (was made known) *to me the mystery*. The **ὅτι** is omitted by BD-lat., Ambros., etc., and is bracketed by L and WH, but is retained by most. The **ἐγνώρισε** of the TR (supported by D[3]KL, etc.) must give place to **ἐγνωρίσθη**, which is the reading of BℵACD[1]F 17, Lat., Syr., Copt., etc., and is adopted by LTTrWHRV. On **μυστήριον** see under i. 9. Here it is the particular **μυστήριον** or "secret" of the admission of the Gentiles on equal terms with the chosen people—a disclosure of the Divine purpose which so often calls forth Paul's adoring wonder. The sentence explains and develops the preceding statement, giving what they heard (**ἠκούσατε**) of the peculiar dispensation made by God with Paul; and the prominent thing here, as indicated by the emphatic position of **κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν**, is the way in which the "mystery" was made known to him, *viz.*, the way of *revelation*.—**καθὼς προέγραψα ἐν ὀλίγῳ**: *as I wrote afore in few words*. The **ἐν ὀλίγῳ** is wrongly taken by some as = **πρὸ ὀλίγου**, "a short time before". It is equivalent to the **δι' ὀλίγων** or the **ἐν βραχεῖ, ἐν βραχέσι** of classical Greek, and means *briefly* (*cf.* Acts xxvi. 28 and the **συντόμως** in Acts xxiv. 4). But what is the writing referred to? It might be a previous letter now lost (Chrys., Calv., etc.). The *aor.* might so far favour this, and the **ἀναγινώσκοντες** of ver. 4, which Meyer thinks excludes it, is not necessarily inconsistent with it. The **δύνασθε ἀναγινώσκοντες νοῆσαι** need not be limited to the reading of the present Epistle, but might equally well apply to the act of reading any other letter, and the terms might suggest indeed a fuller statement of the "mystery" in question than is given anywhere in the first part of this Epistle. The reference, however, might also be to something already said in the present letter, in which case the **προέγραψα** would have the force of "I *have* written already above". This is the generally accepted interpretation, the particular statement in view being that in chap. i. 9, 10, or rather (so Mey., etc.) that in chap. ii. 11-22, in which the inclusion of the Gentiles is the special topic.

Ver. 4. **πρὸς ὃ δύνασθε ἀναγινώσκοντες νοῆσαι τὴν σύνεσίν μου ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ**: *in accordance with which, when ye read, ye can perceive my understanding in the mystery of the Christ*. The **ὅ** refers to the **προγεγραμμένον** indicated in the **προέγραψα**, the **πρός** with acc. expressing here, as often, the idea of the *standard* or *measure* of the **νοῆσαι** (Win.-Moult., p. 505; Bernhardy, *Synt.*, p. 205). Wicl. gives "as"; Cov., "like as"; Rhem., "according as"; Tynd., Gen., AV and RV, "whereby". The aor. **νοῆσαι** follows the present **ἀναγινώσκοντες**, the *perception* being re-

r Acts xiv. 16, xv. 21; ver. 21; Col. i. 26. s Here only; Ps. xxv. 7 al. t Matt. xi. 25; 1 Cor. ii. 10; Phil. iii. 15; 1 Pet. i. 12. u Rev. xviii. 21 only. v 1 Cor. xii. 28; Rev. xviii. 20; ch. ii. 20, iv. 11.

[1] μυστηρίῳ τοῦ χριστοῦ, 5. ὃ ἑτέραις [1] [r] γενεαῖς οὐκ [h] ἐγνωρίσθη τοῖς [s] υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὡς νῦν [t] ἀπεκαλύφθη τοῖς [u] ἁγίοις [2] [uv] ἀποσ-

[1] Rec. before ετερ. inserts εν with a few mss., Copt., Syr.; om. εν ℵABCDEFGK LP, most others, It., Vulg., Arm., Slav., Clem., Orig., Chr., Cyrr. Jer., al.

[2] Omit τοις αγιοις Orig., Thdrt.

garded as a single, accomplished act, the *result* of the process of reading. The verbs **νοεῖν** and **συνιέναι** when contrasted are supposed (*cf.* Tittmann, *Syn.*, p. 191, and Ell., *in loc.*) to differ as *merken*, "perceive," differs from *verstehen*, "understand". But such distinctions are precarious as regards NT Greek. The noun **σύνεσις**, which is applied sometimes to the understanding *mind* (Mark xiii. 33; Wisd. iv. 11), occurs repeatedly in the NT in the sense of mental *apprehension* (Luke ii. 47; 1 Cor. i. 19; Col. i. 9, ii. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 7). It is defined as "*insight* depending on judgment and inference" (Mey. on Col. i. 9), usually in the theoretical sense, but sometimes in the practical (*cf.* Mark xii. 33). It appears to denote *critical* understanding, the apprehension of the bearings of things, while **φρόνησις** conveys the idea of practical, ethical understanding (*cf.* Light. on Col. i. 9; Schmidt, *Synonymik*, chap. xiii., § 10, chap. cxlvii., § 8). Here **σύνεσις** is followed by **ἐν** (*cf.* also 3 Esdras, i. 3), **συνιέναι ἐν** being a common phrase for having understanding in a matter (2 Chron. xxxiv. 12; Josh. i. 7; Dan. i. 17). As the **σύνεσίν μου ἐν τῷ**, etc., makes one idea, the article is dispensed with after the prep. The **τοῦ Χριστοῦ** is taken by some as that of *originating cause* (Hofm.), = the mystery of which Christ is the author; by others as the *gen. objecti*, = the mystery *relating to* the Christ (Abb., Haupt, etc.), by others still as the gen. of *apposition* (Mey., Alf., etc.), or of *identity* (Ell.), = the mystery which *is* the Christ, which He makes, or which is contained in Him. The latter is thought to be favoured by Col. i. 27. But the idea there is that of the Christ *in* us, which is not quite the same; and it seems best on the whole to take the second view, "the mystery relating to the Christ," *i.e.*, the revelation of the long-hidden purpose of God regarding the Christ as not for Israel only, but also for the Gentiles.

Ver. 5. **ὃ ἐν ἑτέραις γενεαῖς οὐκ ἐγνωρίσθη τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων**: *which in other generations was not made known to the sons of men.* The TR inserts **ἐν** before **ἑτέραις**, as in Syr.-Phil. and Copt. But the insertion is due probably to the double dative, and the **ἐν** (which is not found in B ℵ ACDFKL, etc.) is rightly omitted by LTTrWHRV. The **γενεαῖς**, therefore, is the dat. of *time;* the term **γενεά**, like the OT דּוֹר (of which it is the usual rendering in the LXX), meaning the *period* covered by a generation of men (Luke i. 20; Acts xiv. 16, xv. 21; Col. i. 26) as well as the *generation* or *race* itself. By **τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων** are to be understood, not the OT prophets (Beng.) as contrasted with the "Apostles and prophets" of the next clause, but *men* generally and in the absolute sense, in conformity with the **γενεαῖς.—ὡς νῦν, ἀπεκαλύφθη τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ προφήταις ἐν πνεύματι**: *as now it was revealed to His holy Apostles and prophets in the Spirit.* The **ὡς** has its proper *comparative* force. The *fact* of the revelation made in pre-Christian times to the fathers and the prophets is not questioned. The matter in view is the *measure* or *manner* of the revelation. The **νῦν** = "now," *in these Christian times*, and the aor. **ἀπεκαλύφθη** defines the fuller revelation as made definitely at a former period in these times. The verb also has its proper force, as distinguished from the **ἐγνωρίσθη** and as describing the way, *viz.*, by *revelation*, that the truth was made known. The prophets of the OT dispensation were designated **ἅγιοι** (2 Kings iv. 9; Luke i. 20; 2 Pet. i. 21). Those of these Christian times are in like manner designated **ἅγιοι**, as men separated and consecrated to the office and distinguished from the mass of the **υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων**. They are further described as *His* (**αὐτοῦ**), *i.e.*, *God's* Apostles and prophets, God being the subject implied in the **ἐγνωρίσθη** and the **ἀπεκαλύφθη**. The terms **ἀποστόλοις** and **προφήταις** have the same sense here as in ii. 20, *viz.*, the *Christian* Apostles and prophets. The clause **ἐν Πνεύματι** defines the **ἀπεκαλύφθη**; not the **προφήταις**, as if = **προφῆται θεόπνευστοι** (Holzh., Koppe), for the **προφῆται** need no such

τόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ [v]προφήταις [w]ἐν πνεύματι,[1] 6. εἶναι τὰ ἔθνη [x]συγ-
κληρονόμα καὶ [y]σύσσωμα καὶ [z]συμμέτοχα τῆς [a]ἐπαγγελίας[2] ἐν
χριστῷ [b]Ἰησοῦ[3] διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, 7. οὗ ἐγενήθην[4] [b]διάκονος
κατὰ τὴν [c]δωρεὰν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσάν[5] μοι κατὰ

w Ch. ii. 22.
x Rom. viii. 17; Heb. xi. 9; 1 Pet. iii. 7.
y Here only.
z Ch. v. 7.

a Acts i. 4 reff. b=1 Cor. iii. 5 al.; Col. i. 7, 23, 25. c John iv. 10; δ. χ., Rom. v. 15.

[1] After πνευματι insert αγιω DE 4, 19, 34, 38, 55, 61, 72, 74, 91, d, e, Eth.

[2] After επαγγ. insert αυτου D^2D^3EFGKL, etc., Vulg.-ed., Syr.$_{1}$, Thdrt., Dam., Hil., al.; om. ℵABCDP 17, 73, 106-9, Lat., d, e, tol., Syr., Copt., Arm., d, e, Orig.$_{3}$, Cyr., Chr., Jer., Pel., Sedul.

[3] εν τω χριστω DEFGKL, etc., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., etc.; εν Χριστω Ιησου ℵAB CP 17, 47, 73, Vulg., Goth., Cop., etc.

[4] εγενηθην ℵABDFGP 17, 31, 47, 72, 80, Euth., Oec.; εγενομην CD^3EKL, Chr., Thdrt., Dam., etc.

[5] της δοθεισης ℵABCDFGP 10, 17, 23, 31, 39, 47, 57, 73, 80, 137, d, e, f, g, Vulg., Cop., Goth., Euth., Victor., Ambrostr.; την δοθεισαν D^3EKL, al., pler., Goth., Thdrt., Dam., Theophyl., Oec.

definition. As in ii. 22 the **πνεῦμα** here is the Holy Spirit, and the **ἐν** would most naturally be taken in the same sense as these. Here, however, most understand it as the *instrumental* **ἐν**. It seems to combine the two ideas of *agency* and *element* or *condition*, and describes the revelation as having been made *in and by* the Spirit.

Ver. 6. **εἶναι τὰ ἔθνη συγκληρονόμα**: [to wit], *that the Gentiles are fellow-heirs*. The **εἶναι** = *are*, not *should be*, the "mystery" or secret revealed being a *fact*, not a purpose. The *obj. inf.* expresses the *contents* or *purport* of the **ἀποκεκαλυμμένον** (Win.-Moult., p. 400). **συγκληρονόμα** (or **συνκληρονόμα**, LTTr WHRV) = fellow-heirs *with the Jews*; the only occurrence of the word in the NT in this application (for other applications *cf.* Rom. viii. 17; Heb. xi. 9; 1 Pet. iii. 7).—**καὶ σύσσωμα**: *and fellow-members*. **σύσσωμος** (**σύνσωμος**, LTTr WHRV) in the NT occurs only here and is unknown to classical Greek, although Arist. uses **συσσωματοποιεῖν** (*De Mundo*, iv., 30). It was probably constructed by Paul for his present purpose. It means *belonging jointly to the same body*.—**καὶ συμμέτοχα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας**: *and fellow-partakers of the promise*. **συμμέτοχος** (**συνμέτοχος**, LTTrWHRV) is found in the NT only here and in v. 7. It occurs also in Joseph. (*Jew. Wars*, i., 24, 6), and in Justin (*Apol.* ii., 13). The verb **συμμετέχω**, however, is used in classical Greek (Eurip., *Supp.*, 648; Plato, *Theaet.*, 181 c, etc.), although it is not found in the NT. **τῆς ἐπαγγελίας**, not specifically the promise of the Spirit, but, as undefined, the promise of *Salvation*, the *Messianic* promise in its length and breadth. The three terms describe the Gentiles, therefore, first generally as heirs together with the believing Jews in all things, and then more particularly as belonging equally with them to the same corporate body and sharing equally with them in the Messianic promise. The TR inserts **αὐτοῦ** after **ἐπαγγελίας**. It is wanting, however, in the best documents (BℵACD^1, 17, etc.) and is to be omitted. —**ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου**: *in Christ through the Gospel*. For the **τῷ Χριστῷ** of the TR (with DFKL, etc.) read **Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ** (with BℵC, 17, etc.). These words are best taken as qualifying all the three former terms. The joint-heirship, membership, and participation had their objective *ground* and *reason* in Christ Jesus, and were made the actual possession of these Gentiles by the *medium* or *agency* of the Gospel that was preached to them.

Ver. 7. **οὗ ἐγενόμην διάκονος κατὰ τὴν δωρεὰν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ**: *of which I became a minister according to the gift of the grace of God*. The TR reads **ἐγενόμην** (with CD^3KL, etc.). The less usual form **ἐγενήθην**, however, is given by BℵD^{1}F, 17, etc., and is to be preferred. There is no difference, however, in the sense; **ἐγενήθην** being simply the Doric equivalent to **ἐγενόμην**, which reappeared in the LXX and in later Greek generally. **διάκονος** is a *servant, attendant* of any kind; also a *deacon* in particular (Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 8, 12), or a *deaconess* (Rom. xvi. 1), and perhaps a *waiter*, one who serves at table (John

τὴν [d] ἐνέργειαν τῆς [d] δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ. 8. ἐμοὶ τῷ [e] ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ [1] πάντων [f] ἁγίων [2] ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις αὕτη, [3] τοῖς [4] ἔθνεσιν [g] εὐαγγελίσασθαι

d Here only; see ch. i. 19 reff.

e Here only; μειζότερος, 3 John 4.

f Ch. i. 1 reff.

g Ch. ii. 17 reff.

[1] ελαχιστω FG 49. Insert των before παντων P, al., mss., Goth., Cyr., Thdrt., Theophyl.; omit των ℵACDEFGKL, most mss., Orig., Dial., Did.

[2] Insert αποστολων Archel.

[3] After αυτη insert του θεου FG.

[4] Before τοις εθν. insert εν with DEFGKL, mss., nearly It., Vulg., Goth., Syrr., al., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., al., Lat. Fathers; omit ℵABC 23, 31, 61, Copt.

ii. 5, 9). Here it has the general sense of *minister*, as Paul designates himself again in 2 Cor. iii. 6; Col. i. 23. Once he calls himself **ὑπηρέτης** (1 Cor. iv. 1); but with no tangible difference in idea, except that **ὑπηρέτης** may suggest a still greater degree of subordination than **διάκονος**. The distinction drawn by some (Harless) between the two terms, as if **διάκονος** expressed activity in relation to the *service* and **ὑπηρέτης** activity in relation to the *master*, cannot be made good. **τῆς χάριτος** is probably the gen. of *apposition* or *identity* (as the **χάρις** in ver. 8 indicates), = the gift *consisting in* the grace; and the particular "grace" in view is the *office of the apostleship* or the *ministry to the Gentiles* (as vv. 2, 8 suggest), not the *gift of tongues* (Grot.) or the gift of the *Holy Ghost* (Flatt, etc.). That "grace," too, was *God's* gift (**τοῦ Θεοῦ**).—**τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ**: *which was given to me according to the working of His power*. For the **τὴν δοθεῖσαν**, qualifying the **δωρεάν**, of the TR (with CD³KL, etc.) the better reading is **τῆς δοθείσης**, qualifying the **χάριτος** (with BℵAD¹F, 17, etc.; so LTTrWHRV). As the former sentence affirmed the *gift* of the grace, this one states the *manner* of the bestowal. The *standard* or *proportion* of the giving was the *efficiency*, the *efficacious working* (**ἐνέργειαν**) of God's own power. The change in Paul when God made him an Apostle of Christ to the Gentiles was so great that he saw in it nothing less than the result of the Divine omnipotence.

Ver. 8. **ἐμοὶ τῷ ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις αὕτη**: *to me, who am less than the least of all saints, was given this grace*. The **τῶν** inserted by the TR, on slender documentary evidence, before **ἁγίων** must be omitted as wanting in BℵACDFKL, etc. The thought of the dignity of the office he had received at the cost of such grace and power at once evokes the sense of his own utter unworthiness, to which he gives stronger expression here than even in 1 Cor. xv. 9, or 2 Cor. xii. 11. The form **ἐλαχιστότερος**, a comparative of the superlative **ἔλαχιστος**, is found only here. It belongs to a class of double comparisons which had a place probably in the popular modes of speech, but of which a considerable number are found in later literature, especially in poetry. The only other example in the NT is the double comparative **μειζότερος** in 3 John 4; *cf.* Buttm., *Gram. of NT Greek*, p. 28.—**ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαι τὸν ἀνεξιχνίαστον πλοῦτον τοῦ Χριστοῦ**: *to preach to the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ*. The TR inserts **ἐν** before **τοῖς ἔθνεσιν** with) DFKL, etc.); but it is not found in BℵAC, etc., and is best omitted. The former reading would define the *sphere* assigned to Paul in his ministry; the latter, the *subjects* of that ministry. For **τὸν πλοῦτον** the better accredited form is **τὸ πλοῦτος**. The **τοῦ Χριστοῦ** is prob. the gen. of *possess.*, = the riches that Christ *has*, or that are in Him. The **πλοῦτος** thus contained in Christ is the whole wealth of the salvation He bestows; and this is "unsearchable," *i.e.*, not in the sense of *inexhaustible*, but rather in that of *unfathomable*, "past finding out," such as cannot be fully comprehended by man; *cf.* Rom. xi. 33, the only other NT occurrence of **ἀνεξιχνίαστον**; also Job v. 9, ix. 10, xxxiv. 24, the only occurrences in the LXX. It is a picturesque and suggestive word, meaning literally such as cannot be *traced out by footprints*.

Ver. 9. **καὶ φωτίσαι πάντας τίς ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων**: *and to make all see what is the fellowship* (*dispensation*) *of the mystery which from all ages hath been hidden*. The **πάντας** which the TR inserts after **φωτίσαι** is omitted by some MSS. (including ℵ¹A) and certain Fathers (Hil., Jer., Aug., etc.). It is rejected by

τὸ [h] ἀνεξιχνίαστον [i] πλοῦτος [l] τοῦ χριστοῦ, 9. καὶ [k] φωτίσαι πάντας [2] [h] Rom. xi. 33 only; Job. v. 9. [i] Neut., ch. i. 7 reff. [k] John i. 9; ch. i. 18 reff. [l] Ch. i. 10 reff. [m] Ch. i. 9 reff. [n] Matt. xi. 25 ‖ Luke; 1 Cor. ii. 7; Col. i. 26; 4 Kings iv. 27.
τίς [l] ἡ οἰκονομία [3] τοῦ [m] μυστηρίου τοῦ [n] ἀποκεκρυμμένου ἀπὸ τῶν

[1] τον α. πλουτον, with ℵ[3]D[3]EKLP, al., Fathers; το . . . πλουτος ℵABCDFG 17, 67[2]. For του χρ., αυτου 17.

[2] Insert παντας ℵ[3]BCDEFGKLP, Vulg., Chr., Did., Euth., etc.; omit ℵA 67, Cyr., Hil., Aug., etc.

[3] For οικον., κοινωνια with 57, al.

Tisch., accepted by RV in the text, and dealt with by WH as a *secondary* reading. The **κοινωνία** of the TR, which has the slenderest possible authority, must give place to the **οἰκονομία** of the RV with LTTrWH, which is the reading of BℵACDKFL, etc. If the **πάντας** is omitted the sense becomes, as it is given in the margin of the RV, "to bring to light what is" the dispensation. If it is retained, the idea will be that of the *enlightenment of all* as to what the dispensation is. The **πάντας**, however, which occupies an unemphatic position here, *after* the verb (in contrast with the emphatic position of **τοῖς ἔθνεσιν** *before* its verb) can scarcely bear the absolute sense of all *men*, Jew and Gentile alike, but refers to all the **ἔθνη** previously mentioned. The verb **φωτίσαι** is more than **διδάξαι** or **κηρύξαι**. It means to *illuminate*. Paul was not only to deliver his Apostolic message, but also to spiritually enlighten those who heard it, so that they should understand it. The particular thing in that message which is here in view is the **οἰκονομία** (on which see under i. 10), that is, the *dispensation* or *arrangement* of the mystery, to wit the admission of the Gentiles on equal terms with the Jews; the **μυστήριον** here having the same application as in iii. 6. The formula **ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων** occurs in the NT only here and in Col. i. 26; the forms **ἀπὸ αἰῶνος** and **ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος** also occur, the former in Luke i. 70 and Acts iii. 21, the latter in John ix. 32. It means literally "from the ages," "from the world-periods," that is, *from the beginning*, or *since the world began*. It is to be distinguished from **πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων** (1 Cor. ii. 7). The Divine decree was formed *before* the ages of the world began; the keeping of that decree hidden was *since* the ages of the world began, *i.e.*, "from the commencement of the ages when intelligent beings from whom it could be concealed were called into existence" (Ell.). In Rom. xvi. 25 we have the similar description of the **μυστήριον** as **χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου.** —**ἐν τῷ Θεῷ τῷ τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ**: *in God who created all things* [*through Jesus Christ*]. The "mystery" had its place of concealment in *God* Himself, in the Divine mind. And God is designated specially in respect of His *creative power*—"God who created all things" (not "*inasmuch as* He created all things," which would require the omission of the **τῷ**). The **τὰ πάντα**, which also occupies a somewhat emphatic position here, is not to be restricted either to the *physical* creation (Chrys.), or to the *spiritual* (Calv.), but has the absolute sense of *all that exists*. The TR adds **διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ** to the **κτίσαντι** (with D[3]KL, etc.); but these words must be omitted, as the best authorities (BℵAC DF, 17, etc.) do not give them. But why is this reference to God as the *Creator of all things* introduced at this point? By way of confirmation, say some, of what has just been said of the "mystery" as having been hidden from the beginning in God; the point being that He who created all things must have had the contents of this "mystery" in His eternal plan (Mey.). To "enhance the idea of His omnipotence," say others; He who created all things having "*ordained* the mystery itself in the exercise of His undoubted prerogative of sovereign and creative power" (Ell.). Or, as others put it more precisely, its object is to take the wonder from the idea of the "mystery" having been so long unrevealed; the creation of all things by God being a fact which involves His perfect right to adjust all things as He will" (Alf.)—the *Creator of all* being "free to make what arrangements He pleased as to the concealment and revelation of His purpose" (Abb.). None of these interpretations can be said to be either very clear or very adequate. This designation of God as the Creator of all that exists is intended rather to express the *greatness* of the "mystery" that is now disclosed and of

o Col. i. 26; ° αἰώνων[1] p ἐν τῷ θεῷ τῷ τὰ πάντα q κτίσαντι,[2] 10. ἵνα r γνωρισθῇ
plur., Rom. i. 25, ix. 5
νῦν[3] ταῖς s ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς s ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς t ἐπουρανίοις διὰ τῆς
al. fr.; 1 Cor. ii. 7, x. 11; ch. ii. 7; 1 Tim. i. 17; Heb. i. 2, xi. 3. p Col. iii. 3. q Ch. ii. 10 reff.
r Ch. i. 9 reff. s Ch. i. 21 reff. t Ch. i. 3 reff.

[1] After τ. αιων. insert και απο των γενεων FG, g, Syr.

[2] After κτισαντι insert δια Ιησου Χριστου D³EKL, etc., Syr., al., Chr., Thdrt., Thl., Oec.; om. ℵABCDFGP 17, 73, 177-8, al., It., Vulg., Syr., Ar.-erp., Copt., Eth., Arm., Dial., Bas., Cyr., Tert., Jer., Ambr., Aug., Ambrst., Vig., Pel.

[3] νυν om. FG, Syr., all Orig., Tert., all; insert (etc.) Ath., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., al., Jer.$_2$.

which Paul is to be a preacher. The main thought in the verse in question is the thought with which it starts, *viz.*, the marvel of that Apostolic commission of which Paul had been put in trust by the grace of God; and the majesty and the wonder of that commission are made the greater by the grandeur of the "mystery" the Divine disposition of which he was appointed to declare to all men. This "mystery," though long hidden, had been in the Divine mind from the first, and it had been there in such a sense that the whole scheme of created things had it in view, and in such wise that the knowledge of it was to be imparted even to the angelic world (*cf.* Haupt). Or, as it may be better put, the "mystery" now at last revealed by God and proclaimed by Paul to all men in all the sovereign and surpassing wisdom of the Divine dispensation by which it was hidden long and in the fulness of time at last disclosed, was one of God's own eternal secrets, one of His unsearchable thoughts, a thing that had its place from the beginning in His creative plan, a reserve in the Eternal mind that purposed and formed all that exists. And to Paul's hands did the surpassing grace of God commit the proclamation of a truth of such magnitude, the *illumination* (φωτίσαι) of so unsearchable a disposition of the Divine wisdom!

Ver. 10. **ἵνα γνωρισθῇ νῦν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις**: *in order that now unto the principalities and the powers in the heavenlies might be made known.* To make the manifold wisdom of God known where formerly it was not understood is now declared to be the *object* in view. But the object of *what?* The creation of all things, says Harless; who connects the **ἵνα γνωρισθῇ** immediately with the **τῷ τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι**. But, while it is true that redemption is sometimes exhibited in relation to creation (John i. 1-14, etc.), and while Christ Himself is presented at times not only as the author and ground of creation but also as its end or object (Col. i. 16), the idea resulting here on that view would be that the purpose of God in creating all things was the proclamation of His wisdom to the *angelic world by the Church.* This, however, would be a statement without any parallel elsewhere in the NT. It is better, therefore, to connect the sentence immediately with the **τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου,** as is done by Meyer and many more. In that case the idea would be that the "mystery" was long hidden indeed, but hidden only with the design of being made known, and that on the widest possible scale—to angels no less than to men—in due time (*cf.* the general statement of principle in Mark iv. 22). There is much to be said in support of this, *e.g.*, the antithesis of the **νῦν** to the **ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων,** and the **γνωρισθῇ** to the **ἀποκεκρυμμένου,** etc. But it is best to take the verse as referring to the previous **ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις αὕτη,** etc. (Ell., Alf.; and substantially De Wette, Hofm., etc.). The main idea in the paragraph from ver. 7 onwards is unmistakably that of the marvellous call and commission of Paul, and the wonder of the grace that made an Apostle and preacher of him is magnified the more by the Divine purpose revealed in that commission, to wit, the making known the manifold wisdom of God in His ways with sinful men and with the outcasts of the Gentile world in particular. It is objected indeed that this is to make Paul claim for his own preaching and as his own special work what belonged to other Apostles and preachers no less than to him. But all that is stated here goes in point of fact to enhance the idea of Paul's own personal insignificance, the extraordinary and unmerited nature of his call, and his absolute indebtedness to grace. "For this sublime cause," as Alford admirably expresses it, "the humble Paul was raised up—to bring about—he, the

[u] ἐκκλησίας ἡ [v] πολυποίκιλος [w] σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ, 11. κατὰ [x] πρόθεσιν τῶν [y] αἰώνων ἣν ἐποίησεν [z] ἐν χριστῷ [1] Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν,

u Ch. i. 22 reff. v Here only. w=Rom. xi. 33; 1 Cor. i. 21, etc.; Rev. v. 12 al. x Ch. i. 11 reff. y 2 Tim. i. 9. z=Col. i. 16 reff.

[1] Before Χριστῳ insert τῳ ℵ[1]ABC 17, 37, 116, etc.; omit ℵ[c3]DEKL, most mss., Ath., Chr., Thdrt., Dam.; FG om. Χ. Ἰησ.; Clem. om. Ἰησ.

least worthy of the saints—that to the heavenly powers themselves should be made known, by means of those whom he was empowered to enlighten "—the manifold wisdom of God. The **ἀρχαί** and **ἐξουσίαι** can only mean *good* angels (*cf.* under i. 21 above); and these names of *dignity* (the term **ἄγγελος** is not used in this Epistle) are appropriate here as suggesting again the *greatness* of Paul's commission, and perhaps also (as Mey. thinks) the glory put upon the **ἐκκλησία**. That the **ἀρχαί** and **ἐξουσίαι** cannot mean any orders of earthly powers—Jewish, Gentile or Christian rulers or the like, is shown by the **ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις**. Nor can they refer to *demonic* powers, whether by themselves alone or as part of the angelic world, for this would scarcely be consistent with the mention of the *Church*, and further the Divine *power* would in that case be more in point than the Divine *wisdom*. Nor again is there anything in the context to suggest that Paul has in view the angels that ministered the law and the elemental powers honoured by the heathen (V. Soden). The **ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις** here, as elsewhere in the Epistle, has the sense = *in heaven*; see under i. 3 above. The **ἐν**, therefore, has its proper local sense, and is not = *in respect of*, as if the clause meant "in the case of the heavenly things". As the phrase makes one idea, too, with the **ἀρχαῖς** and **ἐξουσίαις**, defining them as *heavenly*, it requires no **ταῖς** after the **ἐξουσίαις**.—**διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας**: *through the Church*. The *Church*, therefore, that is, as is evidently meant here, the whole body of believers in the unity in which Jew and Gentile are now made one, is the *means* by which the Divine wisdom is to be made known and Paul's commission in that respect made good. The Church, which it was his high Apostolic vocation to build up by bringing multitudes of Gentile believers into its membership — the Church in which the breaking down of ancient barriers and the removal of the old enmity were now seen, was itself the living witness to the Divine **σοφία**, the "mirror," as Calvin puts it, "in which angels contemplate the wonderful wisdom of God". And that Divine wisdom is described as **πολυποίκιλος** (a word found only this once in the NT)—not with any reference to *Gnostic* ideas of **σοφία** (as Baur imagined), for the use of such a term as this in that connection is of later date (Iren., *Haer.*, i., 4, 1); nor simply in the sense of *very wise*, for which Aesch., *Prom.*, 1308, is mistakenly cited; but as = *multivarius, multiformis* (Vulg.), *having a great variety of forms*. The adj. is used of the rich variety of colours in cloths, flowers, paintings, etc. (Eurip., *Iph. T.*, 1149; Eubulus, *ap. Athen.*, 15, p. 679 D; *Orph. Hym.*, vi., 11; lxi., 4). In different ways had God dealt with men, with the Jew in one way and with the Gentile in another, in the long course of the ages. But in all these He had had one great end in view. Now in the *Church* the realisation of that end is seen, and in that great spiritual harmony angels can perceive the manifoldness and majesty of that Divine wisdom which by ways so diverse had been working to this great result. That angels have an interest in man's redemption and desire to look into it is stated in 1 Pet. i. 12. Here it is indicated that they are capable of an enlargement of insight into it.

Ver. 11. **κατὰ πρόθεσιν τῶν αἰώνων**: *according to the eternal purpose*. Literally, "according to the purpose of the ages" or "world-periods"; but represented with substantial accuracy by the "eternal" of the AV and the other old English Versions with exception of Wicl. and the Rhemish. The term **πρόθεσις** must be taken here as elsewhere in the proper sense of *purpose*, not in that of *foreknowledge* (Chrys.); and the clause is to be connected neither with the **σοφία** nor with the **πολυποίκιλος** in particular, but with the **γνωρισθῇ**. The disclosure of the manifold wisdom of God to the angelic world, contemplated in the commission given by God's grace to Paul, was of further-reaching moment than that. It was contemplated in God's eternal purpose and took place in accordance with that. The gen. **αἰώνων** may be a gen. of *time* (*cf.* Jude 6); Alf. compares our phrase "an opinion of years"; or it may rather be one of the many forms of the gen. of *possession*—"the purpose

a Acts ii. 29 12. ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν [a]παῤῥησίαν καὶ τὴν[1] [b]προσαγωγὴν ἐν [c]πεποιθήσει Cor. iii. 4; 2 σει[2] [d]διὰ τῆς πίστεως [e]αὐτοῦ. 13. διὸ [f]αἰτοῦμαι [g]μὴ ἐγκακεῖν[3] [h]ἐν

1 Tim. iii. 13; Philem. 8; Heb. iii. 6; 1 John ii. 28; adverbially only in Gospels. b Ch. ii. 18 reff. c 2 Cor. i. 15; Phil. iii. 4 only P.; 4 Kings xviii. 19. d Ch. ii. 8 reff. e Obj. gen., Acts iii. 16 al. fr. f Col. i. 9; 1 John v. 14, etc. g Luke xviii. 1; 2 Cor. iv. 1, 16; Gal. vi. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 13 only. h=John v. 35; Rom. ii. 23 al.

[1] **την** om. ℵAB 17, 80; insert CD[2]KLP, Ath., Euthal., Thdrt., etc.

[2] For **εν πεπ., εν τω ελευθερωθηναι** D[1].

[3] **εκκακειν** CD[3]FGKL, etc., Fathers; **ενκακειν** (ℵB[3], al., **εγκακειν**), ℵABD 13, 17, 37, 39, 46, 47, etc.

pertaining to the ages," formed *before the foundation of the world* (i. 3), long hidden in the Divine Mind (iii. 9), but existent and in God's view from the beginning till now (*cf.* 2 Tim. i. 9).—**ἣν ἐποίησεν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν**: *which he wrought in Christ Jesus our Lord.* The subject of the **ἐποίησεν** is the **πρόθεσις**, not the **σοφία** (Jer., Luth., etc.). The verb is rendered "purposed" by the RV; as it is also taken by many to mean *formed, constituted* (Calv., Harl., Hofm., De Wette, Alf., Abb., etc.). This use of the verb is somewhat like that in Mark iii. 6, xv. 1 (**συμβούλιον ποιεῖν**), etc., and gives a good sense. On the other hand, the use of **ποιεῖν** in such connections as **θέλημα ποιεῖν** (Matt. xxi. 31; John vi. 38; Eph. ii. 3), **γνώμην ποιεῖν** (Rev. xvii. 17), etc., seems to be sufficient justification for giving it the sense of *fulfilling, carrying out;* and the designation *Christ Jesus* (not *Christ* simply), pointing as it does to the historical Person, suggests that what is in view now is the *realisation* of the purpose rather than its *formation.* On the whole, therefore, it is perhaps best to render it "which He *wrought*, or *carried into effect*, in Him whom we preach as Christ Jesus our Lord" (Mey., Ell., etc.). The TR (with ℵ[1-3]C[3]DKL, etc.) gives **ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ**; the best critics (LTTrWHRV), on the authority of BℵAC 17, etc., insert **τῷ** before **Χριστῷ**. The designation **ὁ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν** is singular; *cf.*, however, the **τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Κύριον** of Col. ii. 6.

Ver. 12. **ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν παῤῥησίαν καὶ τὴν προσαγωγήν**: *in whom we have boldness and access.* The second **τήν**, which is inserted by the TR, has the support of some good authorities, CD[3] KLP, Chrys., etc.; but is not found in BℵA 17, etc., and is to be omitted (with LTTrWHRV). As the **παῤῥησία** and the **προσαγωγή** meet in one idea the **τήν** does not require to be repeated. The article before the nouns has much the force of "*our* boldness and access". The **παῤῥησίαν** is not to be limited to *freedom of speech*, freedom in *preaching*, or boldness in *prayer*, but is to be taken in the large sense which it has in Phil. i. 20; 1 Tim. iii. 13; Heb. x. 19; and especially in 1 John ii. 28, iii. 21, iv. 17, v. 14—*freedom of spirit, cheerful boldness, "the joyful mood of those reconciled to God"* (Mey.). The conjunction of the **προσαγωγή** with the intrans. **παῤῥησία** makes the intrans. sense of *access* more appropriate here than the trans. sense of *introduction; cf.* under ii. 18.—**ἐν πεποιθήσει**: *in confidence.* The noun **πεποίθησις** belongs to late Greek (Joseph., Philo., Sext. Empir., etc.). In the LXX it occurs once (2 Kings xviii. 19); in the NT it is found only in Paul (2 Cor. i. 15, iii. 4, viii. 22, x. 2; Phil. iii. 4, and here). It indicates the disposition in which the **παῤῥησία** and **προσαγωγή** are made good.—**διὰ τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ**: *through our faith in Him.* The **αὐτοῦ** is best taken as the *gen. objecti; cf.* Rom. iii. 22; Gal. ii. 16. Thus, as the **ἐν ᾧ** expresses the fact that *Christ* is the *ground* of our **παῤῥησία** and **προσαγωγή**, and the **ἐν πεποιθήσει** the state of mind in which we enjoy these blessings, so this clause declares the *means* by which they become our actual possession. The whole verse, moreover, is not so much a simple addition to the preceding statement as rather an indirect appeal to personal experience, in confirmation of what was said of the fulfilment of God's eternal purpose in Christ Jesus our Lord, the **ἐν ᾧ** having, as Ell. explains it, much the same force as **ἐν αὐτῷ γάρ.**

Ver. 13. **διὸ αἰτοῦμαι μὴ ἐγκακεῖν ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσί μου ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν**: *wherefore I ask that ye lose not heart in my tribulations in your behalf.* The **διό** is referred by some (Mey., etc.) to the immediately preceding verse, the possession of these great privileges of "boldness and access" on the part of the Ephesians being Paul's reason for urging on them the request

which follows. It is better, however, to refer the **διό** to the great thought of the whole paragraph, to which the statement in ver. 12 is subordinate, *viz.*, the dignity of the office committed to Paul and its significance for them. Because the great trust of the Apostleship among the Gentiles is what he has declared it to be for himself and for them, he puts this request before them. The **αἰτεῖν**, which sometimes expresses a *demand* (Luke i. 63; 1 Cor. i. 22), has the simple sense of *asking* here; and in such connections as the present **αἰτοῦμαι** has the full sense of asking *for one's self*. It is followed sometimes by the acc. and inf. (Luke xxiii. 23; Acts iii. 14), and sometimes, as here, by the simple inf. (Acts vii. 46). The idea in the verb **ἐγκακεῖν** is that of *losing courage, becoming faint of heart*. The form **ἐκκακεῖν**, which is given in the TR, appears in CD^{3}FKL, etc. It is doubtful, however, whether that form occurs anywhere in ordinary Greek. It may have had a place in popular, *oral* use. The *written* form was **ἐγκακεῖν**, and that form appears here in most of the best MSS. (B$\aleph$AD^1, etc.). Hence LTrRV adopt **ἐγκακεῖν**; TWH, **ἐνκακεῖν**. But what is the construction here? Some supply **Θεόν**, and make the sense either (1) "I pray God that ye faint not," or (2) "I pray God that I faint not". But if the subject of the **αἰτοῦμαι** had been God, the **Θεόν** could scarcely have been omitted, as there is nothing in the context clearly to suggest it. And that it is the *readers*, not Paul himself, whose possible faint-heartedness is referred to appears from the force of the **ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν** and the **ἥτις ἐστὶ δόξα ὑμῶν**. Paul himself rejoiced in his tribulations (2 Cor. xii. 5, 10: Col. i. 24, etc.), and a prayer in such circumstances as the present betraying any fear about himself would be utterly unlike him. But he might have cause enough to apprehend that these converts might not all view painful things as he did. Hence **ὑμᾶς** is to be understood as the subject of **αἰτοῦμαι** (*cf.* 2 Cor. v. 20; Heb. xiii. 19). The **ἐν** before **θλίψεσι** has the proper sense of *in* (not "at" as RV puts it), pointing to the circumstances, sphere, or relation *in* which the faint-heartedness ought not to show itself (*cf.* Win.-Moult., pp. 482, 483, and Ell., *in loc.*). These **θλίψεις** were **ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν** (the phrase **ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν** going surely with the **θλίψεσί μου**, not with **αἰτοῦμαι** as Harless strangely puts it), as sufferings endured in virtue of Paul's Apostleship among the Gentiles; *cf.* Phil. i. 17. The defining article again is not required before **ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν**, as the phrase makes in reality one idea.—**ἥτις ἐστὶ δόξα ὑμῶν**: *which are your glory*. The distinction between the definite or objective rel. **ὅς** and the indefinite, generic, or qualitative rel. **ὅστις** (*cf.* Jelf, *Gr. Gram.*, 816) is not always maintained in the NT, and indeed the use of **ὅστις** for **ὅς** is as old as Herod. (ii., 92) and Ionic Greek generally (Kühner, *Gr. Gram.*, ii., 906). In the Pauline Epistles, however, the distinction seems to be fairly maintained (Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 173), and **ἥτις** appears here to have the force of an *explanation*—" inasmuch as they are," "for indeed they are". The rel. is referred by some (Theod., Olsh., Harl.) to the **μὴ ἐγκακεῖν**, or to the whole sentence beginning with that; in which case **ἥτις** would stand for **ὅ**. But it is most naturally referred to the **θλίψεσι**. It is a case of attraction, but one in which the noun of the rel. clause gives its number (*cf.* Dem. *c. Aphob.*, p. 853, 31, and in the NT itself, Acts xxiv. 11; Phil. iii. 20) as well as its gender to the rel. (Win.-Moult., p. 206; Buttm., *Gram. of NT Greek*, p. 281; Donald., *Gr. Gram.*, p. 362; Madvig, *Syn.*, § 98). The clause, therefore, gives the readers a reason or motive for not yielding to faintness of heart. Paul's tribulations were endured in their behalf, and were of value for them. The greater the office of the sufferer, the more did the afflictions which he was content to endure for them redound to their honour; and the better this was understood by them, the less should they give way to weakness and discouragement.

Vv. 14-19. A paragraph containing an earnest prayer for the inward strengthening of the readers, the presence of Christ in them, their enlargement in the knowledge of the love of Christ, and the realisation in them of the Divine perfections.

Ver. 14. **τούτου χάριν**: *for this cause*. The sentence begun at iii. 1 and interrupted at ver. 2 is now taken up again. The **τούτου χάριν**, therefore, refers to the great statement of privilege in the latter part of the previous chapter. The ideas which came to expression in the digression in vv. 2-13, are also no doubt in view in some measure. The thought of the new relations into which the Ephesians had been brought by grace toward God and toward the Jews—the reconciliation of the Cross, peace effected where once there was only enmity, the place given them in the household of God—gave Paul cause for prayer in their behalf.—**κάμπτω τὰ γόνατά μου**: *I bow my knees*.

ταῖς [i]θλίψεσίν μου ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, [k]ἥτις ἐστὶν [l]δόξα ὑμῶν.[1] 14. [m]τούτου
χάριν [n] κάμπτω τὰ [n]γόνατά μου [o]πρὸς τὸν πατέρα,[2] 15. [p]ἐξ οὗ πᾶσα
[q]πατριὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς [r]ὀνομάζεται, 16. ἵνα δῴη[3] ὑμῖν

i=Rom. v. 3; 2 Cor. vi. 4; Phil. iv. 14; Col. i. 24.
k Attr., ch. i. 8 reff.
l=1 Cor. ii. 7, xi. 15; Phil. iii. 19; 1 Thess. ii. 20.
m Ver. 1 reff.
n Rom. xi. 4, xiv. 11; Phil. ii. 10 only.
o=Luke xii. 3; 1 Cor. xiii. 12.
p=here only; Xen., *Mem.*, iv. 6, 12.
q Luke ii. 4; Acts iii. 25 only; Num. i. 18.
r Ch. i. 21 reff.

[1] ημων C 17, 31, 33, 37, 71, 72, 80, 116, Cop., Arm., Euth.

[2] Insert του Κυριου ημων Ιησου Χριστου ℵ[3]DEFGKL, Vulg., Goth., Syr., Arm., Orig., etc.; omit ℵ*ABCP 17, 67[2], al., Copt., Æth., Ar.-erp., Thdrt., Orig., Epiph., Euth., Cyrr., Dam., Jer. ("non, ut in latinis codd. additum est, '*ad Patrem Dom. nostri J. C.*,'—sed simpliciter '*ad Patrem*,' legendum").

[3] δω ℵBABCFG 17, 37-9, 116, Meth., Bas., Cyrr., etc.; δωη DEKLP, Valent., Orig., Ath., Chr., Euthal., etc.

A simple, natural figure for *prayer, earnest* prayer (Calv.)—not as if Paul actually knelt as he wrote (Calov.). The standing posture in prayer and the kneeling are both mentioned in the NT (*e.g.*, Mark xi. 25; Luke xviii. 11, 13, for the former, and Luke xxii. 41; Acts vii. 60, xx. 36, xxi. 5, for the latter). For *kneeling* in the OT see 1 Kings viii. 54; Dan. vi. 10; *cf.* also 1 Kings xix. 18.—**πρὸς τὸν πατέρα**: *to the Father*. The **πρὸς** takes the place of the simple dat. which usually follows the phrase **κάμπτω γόνυ** (Rom. xi. 4, xiv. 11), the idea here being that of *prayer*, and of God as the Hearer to whom it was *directed*. The TR, following ℵ[3]DFKL, Lat., Syr., Goth., etc., adds **τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ**. This is an addition which might very readily find a place in the text, the designation being a familiar one, occurring already indeed in this Epistle (i. 3). It does not appear, however, in BℵA*C, 17, Copt., Eth., etc., and it is omitted by the best critics (LTTrWHRV).

Ver. 15. **ἐξ οὗ πᾶσα πατριὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ὀνομάζεται**: *from whom every family in heaven and on earth is named*. The **ἐξ οὗ** denotes the *origin* of the name, the *source* whence it is derived (*cf.* Hom., *Il.*, x., 68; Xen., *Mem.*, iv., 5, 8; Soph., *Œd. R.*, 1036). The verb **ὀνομάζομαι** is also followed by **ἀπό** (Herod., vi., 129); but **ἐκ** conveys the idea of more direct origination (*cf.* Ell., *in loc.*). The noun **πατριά**, for which **πάτρα** is the more usual form in classical Greek, never has the sense of **πατρότης**, *paternitas* (Syr., Goth., Vulg., Luth., and, so far, also Harl.). It means sometimes *ancestry* (Herod., ii., 143; iii., 75), but usually *family* (Exod. vi. 15, xii. 3; Num. i. 2; Luke ii. 4), *race* or *tribe*, *i.e.*, a number of families descended from a common stock (Herod., i., 200; Num. i. 16), *nation* or *people* (1 Chron. xvi. 28; Ps. xxii. 28; Acts iii. 25). In the LXX the **πατριαί** are the מִשְׁפָּחוֹת as distinguished from the **φυλαί**, מַטּוֹת. The Israelites were constituted of twelve **φυλαί** divided into a number of **πατριαί**, each of these latter again consisting of so many **οἶκοι**. Here the word seems to have the widest sense of *class, order, nation, community*, as the idea of *family* in the proper sense of the term is inapplicable to the case of the *angels*, who are indicated by **ἐν οὐρανοῖς**. Further, the anarthrous **πᾶσα πατριά** grammatically can only mean "every family" (see under ii. 21 above), not "the whole family" (Mich., Olsh., etc.). All such ideas, therefore, as that angels and men, or the blessed in heaven and the believing on earth, are in view as now making one great family, are excluded. Nor can **ὀνομάζεται** be made to mean anything else than "are named"—certainly not *exist*, or *called into existence* (Estius, etc.), or "are named *the children of God*" (Beng., etc.). The sense, therefore, is "the Father, from whom all the related orders of intelligent beings, human and angelic, each by itself, get the significant name of *family, community*". The various classes of men on earth, Jewish, Gentile, and others, and the various orders of angels in heaven, are all related to God, the common Father, and only in virtue of that relation has any of them the name of *family*. The *father* makes the family; God is the Father of all; and if any community of intelligent beings, human or angelic, bears the great name of *family*, the reason for that lies in this relation of God to it. The significant name has its origin in the

κατὰ τὸ [s]πλοῦτος [1] τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ [t]δυνάμει [2] [u]κραταιωθῆναι [v]διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ [w]εἰς τὸν [x]ἔσω [x]ἄνθρωπον, 17. [y]κατοικῆσαι τὸν

s Ch. i. 7 reff.
t=Col. i. 11.
u Luke i. 80, ii. 40; 1 Cor. xvi. 13 only; Neh. ii. 18.
v Acts xxi. 4; Rom. v. 5; 1 Cor. ii. 10 al.
w=ch. ii. 21 al.
x Rom. vii. 22; see 2 Cor. iv. 16.
y Col. i. 19, ii. 9 al.

[1] τον πλουτον, with D³KL, etc., Fathers; το πλουτος ℵABCDEFGP 67², 116, Ath.-ms., Ephr.; το πληθος 17.

[2] εν δυν. FG, Copt.; δυναμιν Mac.

spiritual relationship. It is not possible, however, to give proper expression to the thought in English. In the Greek there is a play upon the words **πατήρ, πατριά,** which cannot be reproduced. Some have supposed that Paul has certain Rabbinical notions in view here, or that he is glancing at certain Gnostic theories, or at the vain worship of angels. But there is no ground for such far-fetched suppositions. The Rabbinical conceits regarding angels and the Gnostic speculations were both very different from anything suggested here.

Ver. 16. **ἵνα δῴη ὑμῖν κατὰ τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ**: *that He would grant you according to the riches of His glory.* The **ἵνα** introduces the subject of the prayer, representing it, however, also as the thing which he had *in view* in praying and which made the *purpose* of his prayer (see under i. 17 above). For the **δῴη** of the TR (with DKL, etc.), the RV (with LTTrWH) gives **δῷ** as in BℵACF, 17, etc. (see under i. 17 above). For **τὸν πλοῦτον** (TR, with D³KL, etc.) read again **τὸ πλοῦτος,** with ℵBACDF, etc. The **δόξα** is the whole *revealed perfections* of God, not merely His *grace* or His *power*; and the clause belongs more fitly to the **δῷ** than to the following **δυνάμει κραταιωθῆναι.** The measure of the gift for which Paul prays on behalf of the Ephesians is nothing short of those perfections of God which are revealed now in their glorious fulness and inexhaustible wealth (*cf.* i. 7, 18; ii. 4, 7).—**δυνάμει κραταιωθῆναι διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ**: *to be strengthened by power through His Spirit.* The **δυνάμει** is taken by some as the dat. of *manner*, or as an adverbial expression = *mightily*. But the former mention of the **ἐγκακεῖν** suggests that the power is regarded here as *in* the subjects rather than as put forth by God. Others make it the dat. of *reference*, or take it to denote the particular *form* in which the *strengthening* was to take effect, *viz.*, in the form of *power* as contrasted with *knowledge* or other kinds of gifts. But there is nothing to suggest limitation to one special capacity. Such limitation indeed would be inconsistent with the comprehensive **εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον.** It is best understood as the *dat. instrum.* The *strengthening* was to take effect by means of *power imparted* or infused, and this impartation of power was to be made through the Spirit of God.—**εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον**: *into the inward man.* The "inward man" is viewed here as the *recipient*, that *into* which the strengthening was to be poured, or the *object towards* which the gift was directed. The **εἰς**, therefore, has its full force of "into," and is not to be reduced either to "in" (RV), or to "in regard of" (Mey.). The phrase **ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος** has certain parallels in classical Greek, *e.g.*, **ὁ ἐντὸς ἄνθρωπος** (Plato, *Rep.*, ix., p. 589), **ὁ εἴσω ἄνθρωπος** (Plotin., *Enn.*, v., 1, 10); and it is conceivable that these philosophical expressions had become popularised in course of time, and had penetrated even into the common speech of Jews, or at least into the vocabulary of educated Jews. But the question is—What is the force of the phrase in the NT itself? The two terms **ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος, ὁ ἔξω ἄνθρωπος** denote the two sides or aspects of the nature of man, soul and body, real and phenomenal, enduring and perishable (*cf.* the contrast in 2 Cor. iv. 16); as the terms **ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος, ὁ καινὸς (νέος) ἄνθρωπος** denote his twofold moral nature. The **ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος** itself occurs only thrice in the NT, and all three occurrences are in the Pauline Epistles (Rom. vii. 22; 2 Cor. iv. 16; Eph. iii. 16). It has different shades of meaning there, but the same general sense, *viz.*, that of the *personal subject*, the *rational, moral self*, somewhat similar to the **νοῦς** in Rom. vii. 23, and the **ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος** of 1 Pet. iii. 4. In this **ἔσω ἄνθρωπος** the goodness of the law of God can be recognised so that one can delight in that law. But there is another law that wars against it and brings it into subjection (Rom. vii. 19-23). Hence the **ἔσω ἄνθρωπος** has to be regenerated, and so becomes "the new man," **ὁ καινὸς ἄνθρωπος,** that is created after God (**ὁ κατὰ Θεὸν κτισθείς,** Eph. iv. 24), or **ὁ νέος ἄνθρωπος,** that is renewed (**ἀνακαι-**

z Constr., ch. iv. 2; Col. ii. 2; z ἐῤῥιζωμένοι καὶ a τεθεμελιωμένοι, ἵνα b ἐξισχύσητε c καταλαβέσθαι ῥ., Col. ii. 7 only; d σὺν πᾶσιν τοῖς e ἁγίοις τί τὸ f πλάτος καὶ g μῆκος καὶ h βάθος i καὶ Isa. xl. 24.

a Matt. vii. 25 ‖ Luke; Col. i. 23; Heb. i. 10, from Ps. ci. 25; 1 Pet. v. 10. b Here only; Sir. vii. 6 vat. c Acts iv. 13, x. 34, xxv. 25; Phil. iii. 12, 13. d=Acts x. 2, xiv. 13 al. fr. e=ch. i. 1 reff. f g Rev. xx. 9, xxi. 16 only; Gen. i. 15. h i See Rom. viii. 39.

i υψ. κ. βαθ. BCDEFG 17, 37, 57, 73, 116, It., Vulg., Syr., Ar.-erp., Copt., Eth., Arm., Ath., Cyr., Lucif.. Ambrst., Pel., Jer.; βαθος και υψος ℵAKL, etc., Syr., al., Orig., Chrys., Thdrt., al.

νούμενος, Col. iii. 10). The *strength*, therefore, which was to be communicated by the impartation of new spiritual power through the Holy Spirit was a gift to enrich and invigorate the deepest and most central thing in them—their whole conscious, personal being.

Ver. 17. **κατοικῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν**: *that Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith.* The presence of Christ, His *stated* presence (**κατοικεῖν** as contrasted with **παροικεῖν** = sojourn, *cf.* Gen. xxxvii. 1), the taking up of His *abode* in them (*cf.* the use of **κατοικεῖν** in Matt. xii. 45; Luke xi. 26; 2 Pet. iii. 13; and also its application to Christ Himself in another relation in Col. i. 19), is also embraced in the scope of Paul's prayer. The *indwelling* expressed here by the comp. **κατοικεῖν** is also expressed by the simple **οἰκεῖν** (Rom. viii. 9; 1 Cor. iii. 16). Its *seat* is the **καρδία**—the centre of feeling, thinking, willing (*cf.* Delitzsch, *Bib. Psych.*, iv., 5). And the means or *channel* through which it takes possession of the heart is *faith*, the **διὰ πίστεως** indicating the receptivity which is the condition on our side. There remains, however, the question of the *construction*. The **κατοικῆσαι**, etc., may be taken as dependent on the **δῷ** and as forming a second boon contemplated in the gift prayed for, as if = "and that He may grant you also that Christ may dwell in your hearts" (Mey., Abb., etc.). Or it may be taken as dependent on the **κραταιωθῆναι**, etc., expressing the contemplated *result* of the gift of strength (inf. of *consequence*; *cf.* Acts v. 3; Heb. vi. 10; Apoc. v. 5, xvi. 9, etc.), = "to the effect that Christ may dwell in your hearts". The omission of the connecting **καί** is no insuperable objection to the former; for cases of asyndeton are sufficiently common. But the second view (so Ell., Alf., etc.) is on the whole to be preferred, as it deals better both with the grammatical connection and with the emphatic position of the **κατοικῆσαι**. The former view has the difficulty of taking two somewhat different grammatical constructions as parallels, and it fails to bring out as the latter does the *advance* in the thought. The *indwelling of Christ* is the higher boon which is in view as the end and effect of the *strengthening*.—**ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἐῤῥιζωμένοι καὶ τεθεμελιωμένοι**: *ye having been rooted and grounded in love.* Nothing can legitimately be made of the anarthrous **ἀγάπῃ**, the article being often dropped before abstract nouns, and especially after a preposition (Win.-Moult., pp. 148, 149). As the **ἀγάπῃ** is also without any **αὐτοῦ** or other defining gen., it appears to have its most general sense here, not "the love of *God*" or "the love of *Christ*" in particular, but *love*, the Christian principle or grace which is "the bond of perfectness" (Col. iii. 14). In this love they are described (by two perf. partics.) as "having been *rooted* and *grounded*". If the terms **ἐῤῥιζωμένοι, τεθεμελιωμένοι** were used in their proper etymological connotation, they might suggest much. The former might convey the idea of subjects deriving their life and growth from love; and the latter the idea of subjects built up on the basis of love as living stones in the Divine temple. But the terms are also used without any reference to their original, etymological sense — **ῥιζοῦν**, *e.g.*, in Soph., *Œd. C.*, 1591, means simply to *establish* something *firmly*. So here the two words probably express the one simple idea of being *securely settled* and *deeply founded*. Thoroughly established in love, having it not as an uncertain feeling changing with every change of experience, but as the constant principle of their life—this they must be if they are fully to apprehend the magnitude of Christ's love. Here, again, the *construction* is a difficult question. Westcott and Hort attach **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** to the **κατοικῆσαι** clause and the **ἐῤῥιζωμένοι καὶ τεθεμελιωμένοι** to the **ἵνα** clause. But the **ἐν καρδίαις ὑμῶν** seems a proper and adequate conclusion and completion

of the idea of the *indwelling*. Many (including Meyer, Winer, Buttm., AV, RV, etc.) connect the whole clause with the **ἵνα**, = "in order that, being rooted and grounded in love, ye may be able". This gives an excellent sense, and examples of the transposition of part of a sentence from the natural place after the **ἵνα** to one *before* it are found elsewhere in the NT (*e.g.*, Acts xix. 4; 1 Cor. ix. 15; 2 Cor. ii. 4; Gal. ii. 10; Col. iv. 16; 2 Thess. ii. 7; *cf.* Buttm., *Gr. of N. T. Greek*, p. 389). On the other hand, the relevancy of most, if not all, of these examples is not above suspicion (*cf.* Ell. and Abb. *in loc.*), and it does not appear that in the present passage there is any such emphasis on the **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** as can explain its peculiar position. Hence it is better on the whole to connect it with the *preceding* (as is done in one way or other by Chrys., Luth., Harl., Bleek, De Wette, Alf., Ell., Abb., etc.), and take it as another instance of the nom. absol. or participial anacolouthon (*cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 715; Krüger, *Sprachl.*, § 56, 9, 4; Buttm., *Gr. of N. T. Greek*, p. 298; Blass, *Gr. of N. T. Greek*, p. 285). So we translate it—"ye having been rooted and grounded in love in order that ye may be able," etc. The *rooting* and *grounding* are expressed by the perf. part., as they indicate the state which must be realised in connection with the indwelling of Christ *before* the ability for comprehending the love of Christ can be acquired.

Ver. 18. **ἵνα ἐξισχύσητε καταλαβέσθαι σὺν πᾶσι τοῖς ἁγίοις**: *that ye may be fully able to comprehend with all the saints*. The "may be strong" of the RV is a less happy rendering than usual, as it obscures the fact that the verb is different from that expressing the *strengthened* in ver. 16. The strong compound **ἐξισχύειν**, = to be *eminently able*, to *have full capacity*, occurs only this once in the NT and is rare in ordinary Greek. **καταλαμβάνειν**, = "take hold of" (1 Cor. ix. 24; Phil. iii. 12, etc.) or in the sense of *mental* grasp (Plato, *Phaedr.*, 250 D), in its various NT occurrences in the *Middle* Voice (Acts iv. 13, x. 34, xxv. 25) has only the latter meaning. Here, therefore, it is = *understand*, not = *occupare, take possession of* (Goth., Kypke). The RV substitutes the more neutral *apprehend*—a word capable of either sense—for the "comprehend" of the AV. This gift of spiritual comprehension is contemplated further as to be possessed and exercised **σὺν πᾶσι τοῖς ἁγίοις**, not as a matter of private experience, the peculiar faculty of some, or an exceptional bestowment like the rare privilege of visions, but as a gift proper to the whole community of believers and one in which these Ephesians might share together with all God's people; for the phrase *cf.* i. 15, vi. 18; Col. i. 4; 1 Thess. iii. 13; Philem. 5; Rev. viii. 3; and for the sense of **ἅγιος** see under i. 1 above. **—τί τὸ πλάτος καὶ μῆκος καὶ βάθος καὶ ὕψος**: *what is the breadth and length and depth and height*. So the AV. But *height and depth*, according to the RV. The order of the TR, **βάθος καὶ ὕψος**, is that of ℵKL, Syr., etc.; **ὕψος καὶ βάθος** is that of BCDG, 17, Vulg., Boh., etc. The latter is preferred by LTrWH, the former getting a place in the margin with Tr and WH. What is the object in view in the mention of these dimensions? It is left unnamed. Hence the many conjectures on the subject; *e.g.*, that it is the *Christian Church* (Mich., Koppe, etc.), or *Temple* (Bengel), the *work of redemption*, or the *mystery* previously noticed (Theophy., Harl., Olsh., Bleek, etc.), the mystery of the *Cross* (Est.), the *love of God* (Chrys., Erasm., Grot., etc.), the *wisdom* of God (De Wette), *love* (Moule), *all that God has revealed or done in us and for us* (Alf.). But the context naturally suggests the *love of Christ* (Calv., Mey., Ell.), that being the supreme theme and the one which is immediately set before us in express terms. The imagination of the Fathers, Augustine, Gregory Nyss., Jerome and others, ran riot in the endeavour to find some distinctive, spiritual meaning in each of the four things here named, the shape of the Cross, *e.g.*, being supposed to be signified (Estius), the Divinity of Christ being found in the figure of the *height*, His human nature in the *depth*, the extent of the Apostolic Commission in the *length and breadth*, etc. Nor are the feats of interpretation less forced or fanciful which have been performed by some more modern exegetes. But the terms *length*, *breadth*, *depth*, *height* are introduced with no other purpose than the simple and consistent one of setting forth the surpassing magnitude of Christ's love for us. The power to comprehend that love in its utmost conceivable grandeur and its furthest-reaching relations is what Paul prays God to grant his Ephesians.

Ver. 19. **γνῶναί τε τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνώσεως ἀγάπην τοῦ Χριστοῦ**: *and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge*. Literally, "the knowledge-surpassing love of Christ". The gen. **γνώσεως** is due to the **ὑπερβάλλουσαν** having the force of a *comparative* (*cf.* Aesch., *Prom.*, 944; Hom., *Il.*, xxiii.,

k Ch. i. 19 reff. l=1 Cor. viii. 1, xiii. 2, 8 (see 1 Tim. vi. 20). m=Rom. i. 29, xv. 13; 2 Cor. vii. 4 al. n=Rom. xv. 29.

[i] ὕψος, 19. γνῶναί τε [1] τὴν [k] ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς [l] γνώσεως ἀγάπην [2] τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα [m] πληρωθῆτε [w] εἰς πᾶν [3] τὸ [n] πλήρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ.

[1] τε om. DFG, Copt.

[2] αγ. της γν. A 74, 115, Syr., Ar.-pol., Jer. (*scientiam caritatis* Aug.$_{1}$).

[3] ινα πληρωθη παν B 73, 116.

847; Bernhardy, *Synt.*, iii., 48 B). That the **Χριστοῦ** is the *gen. subj.*, Christ's *love to us*, is made clear by the description of it as surpassing knowledge, which could not be said of our love to Him. The repetition of the same idea in contrasting senses in the **γνῶναι** and the **γνώσεως** has its point not in any antithesis between *theoretical* or *discursive* knowledge (Ell.) and *practical* knowledge, or between *false* knowledge and *true* (Holz), or between *human* knowledge and *divine* (Chrys.), but in the simple fact that there is a *real* knowledge of Christ's love possible to us, a knowledge that is capable of increase as we are the more *strengthened* by power in the inner man, while a *complete* or *exhaustive* knowledge must ever remain beyond our capacity. This petition for the gift of a true and enlarging knowledge (a knowledge which is obviously not a matter of mere intellect but of conscious, personal experience) is connected with the former petition for spiritual *comprehension* by **τε**, and this is presented in the character, not of a *climax*, but of an *adjunct*, an additional statement in supplement of the former. The simple **τε** (as distinguished from **τε . . . καί**) occurs rarely in the Gospels, with greater comparative frequency in Romans and Hebrews, but oftenest by far in Acts. It is used to connect single ideas in Greek poetry (seldom in Greek prose), and is occasionally so used in the NT (*cf.* Acts ii. 37, 40, xxvii. 4; and see Bernh., *Synt.*, xx., 17). In this case it seems to indicate a "closer connection and affinity" than **καί** (*cf.* Blass, *Gr. of N. T. Greek*, p. 263).—**ἵνα πληρωθῆτε εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ**: *that ye may be filled unto all the fulness of God* (or, into the whole fulness of God). The great Vatican Codex (followed by 17, 73, 116) has an interesting variety of reading here, *viz.*, **πληρωθῇ** for **πληρωθῆτε**, the **εἰς** being also dropped. This reading gets a place in the margin of WH. On the difficult term **πλήρωμα** see under i. 10 and especially i. 23 above. The interpretation of this clause is much disputed. The **εἰς** cannot mean *with* or *in*, as it is taken by some, but must = "into" or "unto," expressing the *measure up to* which the being filled is to take effect, the *limit* of the filling, or the *goal* it has before it. The AV and the other Old English Versions erroneously give "with"; except Wicl., who makes it "in," Cov., who renders "into," and Rhem., "unto". The **Θεοῦ** may be the gen. of *originating cause*, = the fulness *bestowed* by God; or, better, the *poss.* gen., = the fulness possessed by God. The main difficulty is the sense of the **πλήρωμα** itself. Some explanations may be set aside as paraphrases rather than interpretations; *e.g.*, that **πλήρωμα** = the *Church* (Koppe, etc.); the *gracious presence of God*, the Divine **δόξα**, *filling* the people (Harl.); the *perfection of* God, in the sense of the highest moral ideal that can be presented to him "in whose heart Christ dwells" (Oltr.), etc. Nor can any good sense be legitimately got by taking it as = **πλήρωσις**—"that ye may be filled with the gifts with which God is wont to furnish men" (Grot.)—an interpretation that cannot be adjusted to the **εἰς**. The choice lies between two views, *viz.*, (1) that **πλήρωμα** has its primary, pass. sense—the fulness that is *in* God, or with which God Himself is filled; or (2) that it has the sense derived from this, *viz.*, *fulness*, *copia*, **πλοῦτος**, **πλῆθος**. The latter is preferred by Meyer, who appeals to such passages as *Song of Songs*, v., 12; Rom. xv. 29; Eph. iv. 13, etc., in support of it, and understands it to convey the special idea of *charismatic* fulness as bestowed by God. So he renders it, "in order that ye may be filled with Divine gifts of grace to such extent that the whole fulness of them (**πᾶν** has the emphasis) shall have passed over upon you". So also substantially De Wette, Abbott, and others, who refer to 2 Pet. i. 4. But there are weighty reasons for preferring the former view with Alf., Ell., Haupt, etc. It gives **πλήρωμα** the largest and profoundest sense, not restricting it to gifts of grace bestowed, but taking it to express the *sum* of *the Divine perfections* (so substantially Chrys.,

20. τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ [o] ὑπὲρ [1] πάντα ποιῆσαι [p] ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ [2] ὧν [o=Philem. 21.] [q] αἰτούμεθα ἢ [r] νοοῦμεν κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν τὴν [s] ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἡμῖν,[3] [p 1 Thess. iii. 10, v. 13; Matt. v. 37. q Ver. 13 reff. r Ver. 4 reff. s=Matt. xiv. 2; Rom. vii. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 6; 2 Cor. i. 6, iv. 12: Gal. ii. 8, iii. 5, Paul esp.

[1] υπερ om. DEFG, d, e, f, g, Vulg., Ambrst., etc.
[2] και υπερεκ. Syr., Schr. et P., Ambrst. [3] εν υμιν A 39, 63.

Rück., etc.), the whole ἀρετή or *excellence* that is in God; *cf.* Chrysostom's ὥστε πληροῦσθαι πάσης ἀρετῆς ἧς πλήρης ἐστὶν ὁ Θεός. It brings the whole paragraph to a conclusion worthy of itself, lifting us to a conception which surpasses all that has preceded it, and carrying us from the great idea of the fulness in Christ to the still greater idea of the fulness in God. Nor is it any valid objection to it that what is thus put before us is what can never be attained in this life. It is an *ideal*, essentially the same as that contained in the injunction to be *perfect* as our Father in heaven is perfect (Matt. v. 48). This interpretation also is most in harmony with the great idea of the *indwelling* of Christ in our hearts, expressing indeed what is implied in that. In Christ the πλήρωμα of God dwells; so far as Christ dwells in us the πλήρωμα of God is in us. In that indwelling lies the possibility of our growing in moral excellence on to the very limit of all that is in God Himself. That they might be *strengthened* in the inner man so as to have Christ's living and abiding presence in them, and be lifted thereby to the comprehension of His love and the personal knowledge of that which yet surpasses all knowledge, and at last be filled with all spiritual excellence even up to the measure of the complete perfection that is in God Himself—this is the sweep of what Paul in his prayer desires for these Ephesians so late sunk in heathen hopelessness and godlessness.

Vv. 20-21. A fervent ascription of praise to God evoked by the thought of the great things which His grace has already wrought in these Gentiles, and the greater things of the future which the same grace destines for them and would have them attain to.

Ver. 20. τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑπὲρ πάντα ποιῆσαι ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ ὧν αἰτούμεθα ἢ νοοῦμεν: *Now unto Him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think.* So both AV and RV; as also the old English Versions, excepting Wicl. ("more plenteously than we axen"), Cov. and Rhem. ("more abundantly than we desire"). More exactly it = "able to do beyond all things, superabundantly beyond what we ask or think" (Ell.). The τῷ refers naturally to *God*, the main subject of the whole paragraph. The δέ has something of its proper adversative force, the contrast between the subjects of the Divine grace and the Divine Giver of the grace being to some extent in view. The doxology brings the whole preceding paragraph and the first main division of the Epistle to a fitting close. Its best parallel is in Rom. xvi. 25-27. The ὑπὲρ cannot be taken as an adverb (Beng.), but governs the πάντα. The πάντα again is not to be connected with the ὧν as if="all that we ask"; the gen. ὧν is due to the *comparative* in the ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ, as in the previous case of the ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνώσεως. Further, the ὑπὲρ πάντα does not belong to the δυναμένῳ, but makes one idea with the ποιῆσαι. Thus we have two distinct descriptions of God here, the second of which explains and develops the thought of the first. He is described first generally in respect of the absoluteness of His power, as "able to do beyond all things," "able to do more than all," *i.e.*, One to whose efficiency there is no limit; and then with more particular reference to the case of Paul and his fellow-believers, as able to do above measure beyond anything with which our asking or even our thinking is conversant; superabundantly beyond the utmost requests we can make in prayer, nay beyond all that can suggest itself to our minds in their highest ventures. The verb νοεῖν, here used of *thinking* of as distinguished from *asking* for, has two main lines of meaning, *viz.*, to *understand* and to *ponder* or *consider*. The latter is in view here. The strong, cumulative ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ occurs again in 1 Thess. iii. 10, v. 13. Such compounds with ὑπέρ (ὑπερλίαν, ὑπερπερισσεύω, ὑπερνικάω, ὑπερυψόω, ὑπεραυξάνω, ὑπερπλεονάζω) are characteristic of Paul. They are not entirely limited to him (*e.g.*, ὑπερπερισσῶς, Mark vii. 37; ὑπερεκχυννόμενον, Luke vi. 38). But they are much more used by him

t 1 Cor. xiv. 21. αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα [t] ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ [1] εἰς πάσας τὰς
19, 28.
u Here only; Dan. vii. 18. γενεὰς τοῦ [u] αἰῶνος [2] τῶν αἰώνων, ἀμήν.[3]

[1] εν τ. εκκ. και εν Χρ. Ιη. ℵABC 17, 73, 80, 213, v., Copt., Jer., etc.; εν Χρ. Ιη. και (εν Ambrst.), τ. εκκλ. DFG, d, e, f, g, Victorin., etc.; εν τη εκκλησια εν Χριστω Ιησου text, D³(Χρ. Ιη. εν τ. εκκ. E)KLP, most mss., Syrr., al., Chrys., Thdrt., Dam.-text, Thl., Oec.

[2] του αιων. om. FG, tol.; *in omnia sæcula sæculorum*, d, e, Ambrst.

[3] αμην om. 57, 67².

than by any other NT writer, occurring nearly thrice as often in the Pauline Epistles and the Epistle to the Hebrews as in all the other NT books (*cf.* Ell., *in loc.*). Such bold compounds are "in keeping with the intensity of his pious feeling, which struggles after adequate expression" (Mey.).—**κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἡμῖν**: *according to the power that worketh in us.* The "power" in question is doubtless the inward operation of the Holy Spirit. The **ἐν ἡμῖν** has the force of an appeal to consciousness. The power that we know to be operative in ourselves is a witness to God's ability to do superabundantly beyond what we ask or think. The efficient power of which we have experience in ourselves represents the measure and mode of the limitless capacity that is in God, and by the one we can conceive of the other and trust it. The **ἐνεργουμένην** must be taken here not as pass., but as middle (*cf.* Gal. v. 6). In Col. i. 29 we have the similar phrase **κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν δυνάμει.** There it is used with reference to the Apostle's *labour* and *striving* at the time; here with reference to the possibilities of God's future dealings with his converts.

Ver. 21. **αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ**: *unto Him be the glory in the Church in Christ Jesus* (better, "and in Christ Jesus"). In the **αὐτῷ** the great Subject of the ascription is named the second time with rhetorical emphasis, and as it stands first in the sentence **εἴη** (not **ἐστί**) is to be supplied. The article with **δόξα** defines it as the glory that is due to Him, or that befits Him. And that "glory" is to be given Him **ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ**, the Church being the domain in which the praise that belongs to Him is to be rendered Him. The reading of the TR, **ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ**, follows such authorities as D²KLP, Syr., Eth., Arm., Goth. It is rendered by some "in the Church *which is* in Christ Jesus". But there is no evident reason for defining the Church here specifically as *in Christ*; for it is the *Christian* Church that is obviously meant, and there is no need to distinguish it from the Church of Israel. Such a construction, too, distinguishing one Church from another, would have been clearer if **τῇ** had appeared before **ἐν Χριστῷ**, although the absence of the article is not fatal to it (*cf.* 1 Thess. i. 1, etc.). Hence those who follow the TR take the words as two distinct clauses, **ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ,** understanding them to mean that the praise which is given in the Church is praise given in Christ in virtue of her union with Him as her Head, or taking them to point first to the Church as "the outward domain in which God is to be praised" and then to Christ as the "spiritual sphere in which this ascription of praise is to take place" (Mey.), it being only *in Christ* that believer or Church can really praise God. There is, however, a small, but important addition made to the text by some of the oldest and best authorities, by the insertion of **καί** before the **ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.** The evidence is so strong (BℵAC, 17, Vulg., Boh., etc.) that the **καί** can scarcely be refused, and it is accepted by LTTrWHRV. So the sentence becomes "in the Church *and* in Christ Jesus," and the idea is that praise is to be given to God and His glorious perfections shown forth both in the Church which is the body, and in Christ who is the Head—in the Church as chosen by Him, and in the Christ as given, raised, and exalted by Him. So Haupt, with a somewhat similar idea, understands the sense to be that the glorifying of God takes place in outward-wise in the circle of the Church and at the same time in such inward-wise that it is in Christ.—**εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν**: *unto all generations for ever and ever. Amen.* More exactly "unto all the generations of the age of the ages. Amen." Another of these reduplicated, cumulative expressions by

IV. 1. [a] Παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς ἐγὼ ὁ [b] δέσμιος ἐν κυρίῳ,[1] [c] ἀξίως [d] περιπατῆσαι[2] τῆς [e] κλήσεως [f] ἧς ἐκλήθητε, 2. [g] μετὰ πάσης [h] τα-

a = Matt. viii. 5 al. fr.; Rom. xii. 1.

b Ch. iii. 1 reff. c Term and constr., Rom. xvi. 2; Phil. i. 27; Col. i. 10; 1 Thess. ii. 12; Paul only, exc. 3 John 6. d = Acts xxi. 21 al. fr.; princ. Paul and John. e Rom. xi. 29; 1 Cor. i. 26; ch. i. 18; Paul only, exc. 2 Pet. i. 10. f Attr., ch. i. 7 reff. g = Matt. xxviii. 8; 1 Chron. xxix. 22 al. fr. h Acts xx. 19 (Paul); Phil. ii. 3; Col. ii. 18, 23, iii. 12; Paul only, exc. 1 Pet. v. 5; see Ps. cxxx. 2.

[1] εν Χριστω ℵ Eth. [2] περιπατησατε 17.

which the mind of man working with the ideas of time labours to convey the idea of the eternal. The formula may be, as was suggested by Grotius, a combination of two distinct phrases of similar meaning, one in which continuance, endless continuance, is expressed in terms of **γενεά, γενεαί** (*cf. e.g.*, Luke i. 50; **εἰς γενεὰς γενεῶν**, or **εἰς γενεὰς καὶ γενεὰς** with LTTrWHRV); and another in which the same idea is expressed in terms of **αἰών, αἰῶνες** (*cf.* **εἰς αἰῶνας αἰώνων**, Rev. xiv. 11; **εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων**, Gal. i. 5, etc.). The peculiarity here is the conjunction of the two formulæ and the use of the sing. **αἰών** in the latter; *cf.* **εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος**, 3 Esdr. iv. 38; **ἕως αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων**, Dan vii. 18; **εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα [τοῦ αἰῶνος]**, Heb. i. 8; **εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος**, 2 Pet. iii. 18. The precise idea underlying the phrase is not quite clear. It may be that the everlasting future is thought of as one long "age" embracing in it an unnumbered succession of "generations" and making the sum and crown of all possible "ages". Or the "age of the ages" may have the force of a superlative, "the age *par excellence*," the "age beside which there is none other to be named," and that regarded as containing in itself all conceivable "generations". More precisely, the idea of the *Parousia* may be behind all, the age (**ὁ αἰών**) being the Messianic age which opens with the Parousia, brings all other "ages" with the "generations" belonging to them to an end, and is itself to endure for ever. Thus, as Meyer puts it, the idea is that the glory to be given to God in the Church and in Christ its Head is to "endure not only up to the Parousia, but then also ever onward from generation to generation in the Messianic æon —consequently to last not merely **εἰς τὸ παρόν**, but also **εἰς τὸ ἀΐδιον**". The **ἀμήν**, which occurs so frequently in our Lord's discourses at the beginning of an affirmation, is used here, as so often in the OT, at the close of the sentence in the sense of *so be it* (LXX, **γένοιτο**; *cf.* Num. v. 22, etc.). It was the people's assent in OT times to declarations made at solemn assemblies (Deut. xxvii. 15; Neh. v. 13, viii. 6, etc.). It was also their response to the prayers offered in the synagogue, and from 1 Cor. xiv. 16 we gather that this use of the word was continued in the Christian Church.

CHAPTER IV. Vv. 1-16. With the fourth chapter begins the second main division of the Epistle. As in others of Paul's Epistles the doctrinal statement is followed by the practical enforcement of duty. Doctrinal considerations are at the same time introduced again from point to point in support of the duties enjoined. The hortatory section commences with the earnest recommendation of a life in conformity with the Christian vocation, with special reference to the need of humility, loving consideration and unity.

Ver. 1. **παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς ἐγὼ ὁ δέσμιος ἐν Κυρίῳ**: *I therefore, the prisoner in the Lord, beseech* (or, exhort) *you.* In more exact accordance with the *order* of the words—"I beseech you, therefore, I the prisoner in the Lord". The **οὖν** connects the practical charge with the preceding statement of doctrine and privilege, and establishes the one upon the other. The connection is taken by some to be with the statement just made in iii. 21 regarding the Church (Mey.). A reference of a larger scope, however, seems more in harmony with the contents of the paragraph. It is best, therefore, to understand the **οὖν** as basing the exhortations which follow on the whole preceding statement of the great things done for the readers by God's grace—from chap. iii. 6 onwards. The verb **παρακαλῶ** is rendered "beseech" by Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem., AV, RV, while the Genevan gives "pray". But in Tynd., Cov., Cran., Bish., it is "exhort," and this is the more probable shade of meaning here in view of the context (Alf., Ell.). In classical Greek the dominant idea of the verb, except when it is used with reference to the gods, is that of *admonishing* or *exhorting*. In later Greek and in the NT the idea of *entreating* has its place along

with the other. For the force of the article in **ὁ δέσμιος** and the anarthrous **ἐν Κυρίῳ**, see under iii. 1 above. The **ἐν Κυρίῳ** belongs not to the **παρακαλῶ** (Semler), but to the **δέσμιος**. It expresses the *sphere* within which his captivity subsisted or the *ground* of that captivity. He was a prisoner because of his connection with Christ, the Lord, and for no other reason. As in chapter iii., so here the idea of the dignity of his office seems to lie behind the mention of his imprisonment. He designates himself "the prisoner in the Lord" not with a view to stir the *sympathy* of the readers and enforce his exhortation by an appeal to feeling, but as one who could rejoice in his sufferings and speak of his tribulations as their "glory" (iii. 13; Gal. vi. 17).—**ἀξίως περιπατῆσαι τῆς κλήσεως ἧς ἐκλήθητε**: *to walk worthily of the calling wherewith ye were called.* As the phrase **καλεῖν κλήσει** occurs (*cf.* 2 Tim. i. 9, and, with **ἐν**, 1 Cor. vii. 20), the **ἧς** may be by attraction for **ᾗ**. As that, however, is a doubtful application of the law of attraction, and as the formula **κλῆσιν καλεῖν** is found in Arrian, *Epict.*, p. 122, it is to be explained rather as = **ἣν** (*cf.* i. 6; 2 Cor. i. 4; and Win.-Moult., p. 202). With the **ἀξίως τῆς κλήσεως** *cf.* **πολιτεύεσθαι ἀξίως τοῦ εὐαγγελίου**, Phil. i. 27; **περιπατεῖν ἀξίως τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ καλοῦντος (καλέσαντος)**, 1 Thess. ii. 12; **περιπατῆσαι ἀξίως τοῦ Κυρίου**, Col. i. 10.

Ver. 2. **μετὰ πάσης ταπεινοφροσύνης καὶ πραότητος**: *with all lowliness and meekness.* Statement of moral dispositions which should *attend* their walk; **μετά** conveying the idea of *accompaniment, relation, association*, while **σύν** suggests closer *conjunction, fellowship*, especially a fellowship which *helps*. Krüger (*Sprachl.*, § 68, 13, 1) puts the distinction thus—"**σύν τινι** denotes rather *coherence*, **μετά τινος** rather *coexistence*" (*cf.* Win.-Moult., pp. 470, 488). As in the case of **πᾶσα σοφία** (i. 8), **πᾶσα ταπεινοφροσύνη** can mean only "all lowliness," "all *possible* lowliness," or "*every kind* of lowliness," not *summa humilitas*. The word **ταπεινοφροσύνη** is of very rare occurrence in non-biblical Greek, and when it does occur it has the sense of *pusillanimity* (Epictet., Diss., 3, 24, 56; Joseph., *Jewish Wars*, iv., 9, 2). It is not used in the OT; but in the NT it denotes one of the *passive* graces, unrecognised or repudiated in Græco-Roman ethics, which Christianity has glorified—the lowliness of mind which springs from a true estimate of ourselves—a deep sense of our own moral smallness and demerit (*cf.* Acts xx. 19; Phil. ii. 3; Col. iii. 12; 1 Pet. v. 5; Col. ii. 18, 23, of a false humility). **πραότης**, or better **πραΰτης** (TTrWH) in the later form and without iota subscript; *cf.* Buttm., *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 26 (who regards the form **πρᾶος** as apparently "unknown to the language of the NT"); and Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 7 (who thinks there is not sufficient evidence to decide between **πραότης** and **πραότης**). It means more than *modestia* (Vulg.), *mansuetudo*, **ἀταραξία**, *gentleness*, or *equanimity*, inasmuch as it has regard to our attitude towards God as well as towards men, and includes more than outward behaviour or natural disposition. It is a grace of the Spirit, the disposition of loving submissiveness in the first place to God and His dealings with us, and, as the consequence of that, of quiet restraint, mildness and patient abnegation of self in face of the provocations of others. It is a moral quality, therefore, with a far wider scope, a larger significance, a deeper and more vital relation to character than was thought of by the philosophers and moralists of the old world, who regarded it only as the opposite of **ἀγριότης**, *savageness* (Plato, *Symp.*, 197 *d*), **χαλεπότης**, *harshness* (Arist., *Hist. Anim.*, ix., 1), or **ἀποτομία**, *roughness* (Plut., *De lib. ed.*, 18); *cf.* Trench, *Syn.*, pp. 143, etc.; Schmidt, *Synon.*, 98, 2.—**μετὰ μακροθυμίας**: *with long-suffering.* This is best taken as an independent clause, which is developed in the following sentence. Some (Theod., Beng., etc.) attach both the **μετὰ πάσης ταπ.**, etc., and the **μετὰ μακρ.** to the **ἀνεχόμενοι** clause. But this gives one long sentence, which obscures the transition from idea to idea and makes the several clauses less distinctive. Others (Calv., Harl., Rück., Ols., etc.) attach the **μετὰ μακρ.** to **ἀνεχόμενοι**; but to make it part of that clause takes from the point of the **μακροθυμία** and disturbs the balance of the clauses, in which we have first the general idea of worthiness of walk, then certain particulars involved in that, and then the further explanation (in the **ἀνεχόμενοι** clause) of these various particulars or of the one last noticed. The term **μακροθυμία** means both *endurance* or *constancy* in presence of illness and trouble (Col. i. 11; 2 Tim. iii. 10; Heb. vi. 12; James v. 10), and, as here (*cf.* also Rom. ii. 4, ix. 22; 2 Cor. vi. 6, etc.), the abnegation of revenge in presence of wrong—the opposite of **ὀργή** (Prov. xvi. 32), **ὀξοθυμία** (James i. 19), etc., and akin to **ὑπομονή** (2 Cor. vi. 4, 6; Col. i. 11; 2 Tim. iii. 10; James v.

πεινοφροσύνης καὶ [i]πραΰτητος,[1] μετὰ [k]μακροθυμίας, [l]ἀνεχόμενοι i 1 Cor. iv. 21 reff.; ἀλλήλων ἐν ἀγάπῃ, 3. [m]σπουδάζοντες [n]τηρεῖν τὴν [o]ἑνότητα τοῦ Ps. xliv. 4. πνεύματος ἐν τῷ [p]συνδέσμῳ τῆς εἰρήνης.[2] 4. [q]ἓν σῶμα καὶ [r]ἓν k Rom. ii. 4 in Paul; James v. 10; 1 Pet. iii. 20; 2 Pet. iii. 15; Prov. xxv. 15. l Term and constr., Matt. xvii. 17; ll Acts xviii. 14; 1 Cor. iv. 12; 2 Cor. xi. 11; Col. iii. 13 Paul; Isa. lxiii. 15. m Gal. ii. 10; 1 Thess. ii. 17; 2 Pet. i. 10, 15, iii. 14; Isa. xxi. 3. n=1 Cor. vii. 37; 2 Cor. xi. 9; 1 Thess. v. 23 al.; James i. 27 al. o Ver. 13 only. p Acts viii. 23; Col. ii. 19, iii. 14 only; Isa. lviii. 6. q Ch. ii. 16 reff. r Ch. ii. 18 reff.

[1] πραοτητος ADEFGLO, most others, Chr., Euth., Thdrt., Dam., etc.; πραυτητος ℵBC 17; υπακοης 117.

[2] For ειρ. αγαπης K 1.

10, 11). The word belongs to later Greek (Plut., Macc., etc.), and the LXX; but in neither has it the exact sense it gets in the NT.—**ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων ἐν ἀγάπῃ**: *forbearing one another in love.* Explanation and application of the **μακροθυμία.** By a natural and familiar irregularity which gives effect to the logic of the statement rather than to the construction the partic. reverts from the acc. to the nom. (*cf.* Col. i. 10; Krüger, *Sprachl.*, § 56, 9, 4). To attach **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** (Orig., Lachm., Olsh., etc.) to the following **σπουδάζοντες** is to make the **ἀνεχόμενοι** abrupt and bare, and to disturb the harmonious form of the participial sentences. The duty of mutual forbearance is to be practised *in love.* It was to be a *loving* forbearance—a forbearance having its motive, its inspiration, its life, in love.

Ver. 3. **σπουδάζοντες τηρεῖν τὴν ἑνότητα τοῦ πνεύματος**: *giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit.* Further description of the mutual forbearance in respect of the *inward effort* required, but introducing also the larger, fundamental idea of *unity*. **σπουδάζω,** which conveys the idea of *exertion*, is better rendered "giving diligence" (RV) or "earnestly striving" (Alf.), than "endeavouring" (AV). **τηρεῖν** = *keep*, in the sense of maintaining with watchful care; suggesting also that what is to be *kept* is something already in our possession. **τοῦ Πνεύματος** is the gen. of *originating cause*, = the unity which the Spirit produces or works, and here the oneness in feeling, interest and purpose which is appropriate to the oneness in doctrine and privilege whereof the readers are immediately reminded. Commentators, even of the rank of Calvin, have interpreted the **πνεύματος** here as the *human spirit*, the Christian spirit of concord; while others (De Wette, etc.) have taken it to denote the spirit of the Christian community. But the **ἓν Πνεῦμα** of the following verse, the general NT doctrine of the Spirit of God as operating in the believer and in the Church (*cf.* ii. 22), and the analogy of such passages as 1 Cor. xii. 13, point clearly to the Holy Spirit.—**ἐν τῷ συνδέσμῳ τῆς εἰρήνης**: *in the bond of peace.* This is not to be attached to the next verse (Lach.), a connection which would again disturb the symmetry of the participial sentences and rob some of the statements which follow of their appropriateness. It defines the way in which the unity is to be kept. The **ἐν** is not the *instrumental* **ἐν**, = "by means of the bond of peace"; but, as in **ἐν ἀγάπῃ**, the *local* **ἐν** or that of *relation* specifying the *sphere* (Ell.), or the *ethical relation* (Mey.) in which the unity is to be maintained. The **εἰρήνης** might be the *gen. obj.*, = "the bond by which peace is kept," to wit, *love* (Beng., etc.). But it is best understood as the gen. of *apposition* (Mey.), or *identity* (Ell.), = "the bond which *is* peace". The unity, therefore, which is wrought among these Ephesians by the Spirit of God will be theirs in so far as they make peace the relation which they maintain one to another, or the bond in which they walk together. In Col. iii. 14 *love* is the "bond of perfectness"; but the construction and the idea are different here.

Ver. 4. **ἓν σῶμα καὶ ἓν πνεῦμα**: *There is one body and one Spirit.* This is not to be taken as part of the exhortation, **ἐστέ** or **γίνεσθε** being understood (Calv., Est., Hofm., etc.); for that would not be consistent with the following **εἷς Κύριος, εἷς Θεός.** It is a positive statement, made all the more impressive by the lack of **γάρ** or any connecting particle, and giving the objective ground, or basis in fact, on which the walk in lowliness, meekness, long-suffering and loving forbearance is urged, and of which it should be the result. The **σῶμα** is the whole fellowship of believers, the mystical body of Christ (*cf.* ii. 16; Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. x. 17, xii. 13; 1 Col.

s 1 Cor. vii. 15; 1 Thess. iv. 5. πνεῦμα, καθὼς καὶ[1] ἐκλήθητε [s] ἐν μιᾷ ἐλπίδι τῆς [e] κλήσεως ὑμῶν· εἷς κύριος, μία πίστις, ἓν βάπτισμα, 6. εἷς θεὸς καὶ[2] πατὴρ 7.

[1] και (after καθως) om. B 19, 32, 39, 43, 55, 114, 213-38, al., Vulg., Syr., Goth., Chr.$_1$, Ambrst.

[2] After θεος om. και 38, 47, 114, Syr., Ar.-erp., Eth., Chr.-text, Iren., Euseb.

i. 24). The **Πνεῦμα,** as in ii. 18, is the Holy Spirit who is in the Church and in whom we are "baptised into one body" (1 Cor. xii. 13). The idea that this great sentence means only that we are to be united so as to be one body and one soul, though supported by Calvin, is out of harmony with the larger scope of the following verses, and in any case stands or falls with the view that this verse is part of the exhortation.—**καθὼς καὶ ἐκλήθητε ἐν μιᾷ ἐλπίδι τῆς κλήσεως ὑμῶν**: *even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling.* **καθὼς** (late Greek for the **καθά, καθό, καθάπερ** of the Atticists and the earlier writers; *cf.* under i. 4, iii. 3 above) illustrates and enforces the unity as something entirely in accordance with their calling, the **καί** marking this as a second thought suggested by the first. The **ἐν** may be *instrumental* (so Mey., referring to Gal. i. 6), the point then being that the calling came *by means* of one hope, *viz.*, that of the Messianic salvation. But it is rather = *in*, expressing the ethical domain or element in which the calling took place (Ell.). The **κλήσεως** is the gen. of *origin* or *efficient cause*, = the hope *originated* or *wrought* in you by your calling, as in i. 18 (Ell., Mey.); rather than the gen. of *possess.*, = the hope *belonging* to your calling. The fact that, when they were called out of heathenism, one and the same *hope* was born in them, is a fact in perfect keeping with the unity of the Christian body and the unity of the Divine Spirit operating in it, and the one confirms and illumines the other.

Ver. 5. **εἷς Κύριος, μία πίστις, ἓν βάπτισμα**: *one Lord, one faith, one baptism.* "One Lord," that is Christ, He alone and He for all equally whether Gentile or Jew. "One faith," *i.e.*, one belief having Him as its object; **πίστις** having here its usual subjective sense of *saving trust*, not = that which is believed, the Christian *doctrine* or *creed* (Grot.)—a meaning which is at the best very rare in the NT and not quite certain even in most of the passages usually cited in support of it (Acts vi. 7; Gal. i. 23; 1 Tim. i. 4, 19, ii. 7, iv. 1, 6, v. 8, vi. 10, 21), but most probable in Jude iii. 20. "One baptism"—the rite, one and the same for all, by which believers in Christ are admitted into the fellowship of His Church, and which is described as "into Christ" (Rom. vi. 3; Gal. iii. 27), into His *name* (Acts x. 38, 48, xix. 5), into the "name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. xxviii. 19). No mention is made of the Lord's Supper. This is the more remarkable in view of the fact that elsewhere it is referred to as a token of unity (1 Cor. x. 17). Various explanations of the omission have been given—*e.g.*, the desire to preserve the rhythmical form of the sentence, together with the fact that the Lord's Supper did not as yet stand by itself, but was combined with ordinary Christian meals (Mey.); the fact that it was more a *representation* than a *condition* of unity (De Wette); the consideration that it is not like baptism an *initial, fundamental* rite, but one that comes to be observed after admission (Harl.). None of these reasons can be called satisfactory, nor have we the materials for an adequate explanation.

Ver. 6. **εἷς Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ πάντων**: *one God and Father of all.* This supreme name, **Θεὸς** or **ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατήρ,** is used both absolutely (1 Cor. xv. 24; Eph. v. 20; Jas. i. 27), and with defining terms, *e.g.*, **τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν,** i. x. (Rom. xv. 6; Eph. i. 3; 2 Cor. i. 3; 1 Pet. i. 3), **ἡμῶν** (Gal. i. 4; Phil. iv. 20; 1 Thess. iii. 11, 13; 2 Thess. ii. 16), **πάντων** (here; *cf.* the longer designation **εἷς Θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα,** 1 Cor. viii. 6). *Christian* unity being here in view, the name applies to the special Fatherhood of God in grace, not (with Holz., Abb.) to the universal Fatherhood of God and His relation to *all* men. Attention is rightly called by Mey. and others to the *advance* in the thought in these verses from *Church* to *Christ*, and from *Christ* to *God* who is One in the highest and most absolute sense—the One source of life and good in all His people, the one to whom both Christ and the Spirit are related.—**ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων, καὶ διὰ πάντων, καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν ὑμῖν**: *who is over all, and through all, and in* [*you*] *all.* The **ὑμῖν** of the TR (following some cursives and

πάντων, ὁ [t]ἐπὶ πάντων[1] καὶ [u]διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν.[2] 7. [v]ἑνὶ δὲ ἑκάστῳ ἡμῶν[3] ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις κατὰ τὸ [w]μέτρον τῆς [x]δωρεᾶς τοῦ χριστοῦ. 8. διὸ [y]λέγει [z][3]Αναβὰς εἰς [a]ὕψος [b]ἠ[4]χμαλώτευσεν[4] [c]αἰχ-

t Rom. ix. 5 al.
u Constr., see Gal. i. 1; Col. i. 16; 1 Cor. xii. 8; Rom. iii. 22; pec. to Paul. Paul only.
v Ver. 16 reff.
w=Rom. xii. 3; 2 Cor. x. 13; vv. 14, 16; x Ch. iii. 7 reff.
y Gal. iii. 16; 1 Cor. vi. 16; James iv. 6; Heb. x. 5.
z Ps. lxvii. 18. Num. xxi. 1; Jud. v. 12; 2 Chron. xxviii. 17.
a=Luke i. 78, xxiv. 49.
b 2 Tim. iii. 6 only.
c=Rev. xiii. 10 only;

[1] **ο επ. παντ.** om. 2, 46, Ps.-Ign., Cyr., Hil.

[2] After **πασιν** add **υμιν** some cursives, Ch., Thdrt., Theophyl., Oec.; **ημιν** DEFGKL 23, 37-9, 44-8, It., Vulg., Syr., Goth., al., Did., Dam., Iren., al.; **πασιν** alone, ℵABCO²P 17, 31, 67, 71, 73, 80, 109, 177, Copt., Eth., Arm., Marc., Orig., Euseb., etc.

[3] **υμων** B 38, 109, Thdrt.

[4] **ηχμαλωτευσας** AL 71, 114, al.₄, Eth. (and **εδωκας** after); **αιχμαλωτευσας** 47, 71.

Fathers), and the variant **ἡμῖν** (in DFKL, Lat., Syr., Goth., etc.) must be omitted (with LTTrWHRV) as having no support from BℵAC, 17, Copt., Eth., etc. The **πάντων** and the **πᾶσιν** are most naturally taken as masculines here, in harmony with the previous **πάντων**. The clause, therefore, expresses a three-fold relation of the One God and Father to the *all* who are His: *first*, the relation of *transcendence* (Mey.) or *sovereignty*—**ἐπί** (= **ὑπεράνω**, *over* or *above*) expressing the supremacy of absolute Godhead and Fatherhood; *second*, that of *immanence*—**διά** (= *through*) expressing the pervading, animating, controlling presence of that One God and Father; and *third*, that of *indwelling*—the **ἐν** expressing the constant abode of the One God and Father in His people by His Spirit. Neither the creative action of God (Est.), nor His providential rule (Chrys., Grot.), is in view, but what He is to the Christian people in His dominion over them and His gracious operative presence in them.

Ver. 7. **ἑνὶ δὲ ἑκάστῳ ἡμῶν ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις**: *but unto each one of us was given the grace.* For **ἡμῶν** some few authorities (including, however, B) read **ὑμῶν**. After **ἡ χάρις** some few insert **αὕτη** (C², 31, etc.). The article before **χάρις** is omitted in BD¹FL, etc., but inserted in ℵACD³K, etc. The evidence is pretty evenly balanced. Hence WH bracket **ἡ**; TRV retain it; LTr omit it. The article defines **χάρις** as *the* grace of which the writer and his fellow-believers had experience, which they knew to have been given them (**ἐδόθη**), and by which God worked in them. What is given is not the **χάρισμα** but the **χάρις**, the subjective grace that works within and shows itself in its result—the *charism*, the gracious faculty or quality. The emphasis is on the **ἑκάστῳ**, and the **δέ** is rather the *adversative* particle than the transitional. It does not merely mark a change from one subject to another, but sets *the each* over against the *all*, and this in connection with the injunction to keep the unity of the Spirit. God's gracious relation to *all* is a relation also to each *individual*. Not one of them was left unregarded by Him who is the God and Father of all, but each was made partaker of Christ's gift of grace, and each, therefore, is able and stands pledged to do his part toward the maintenance of unity and peace. (*Cf.* Rom. xii. 6.)—**κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τῆς δωρεᾶς τοῦ Χριστοῦ**: *according to the measure of the gift of Christ.* Statement of the *law* of the bestowal of grace. Each gets the grace which Christ has to give, and each gets it in the proportion in which the Giver is pleased to bestow it; one having it in larger measure and another in smaller, but each getting it from the same Hand and with the same purpose. The **δωρεᾶς** is the gen. of the *subject* or *agent*—the gift which Christ gives, as is shown by the following **ἔδωκε δόματα.**

Ver. 8. **διὸ λέγει**: *wherefore He saith, when He ascended on high.* The **διό** introduces the words which follow as a *confirmation* of what has just been said; and these words are not a parenthesis, but part of a direct and continuous statement; = "the fact that it is thus with Christ and His gift, and that the grace which we possess is bestowed by Him on each of us in varying measures as He distributes it, has the witness of God Himself in OT Scripture". The quotation which follows is obviously taken from Psalm lxviii. 18, and in the main in the form in which it is given in the LXX. There are difficulties in the rendering which Paul uses and in the application he makes of it. But they are not such as to

ustify the assertion that the passage is a quotation from some Christian hymn, and not from Scripture. There is nothing in the verse or in the context to suggest anything else than the Psalm. The question s raised whether the introductory **λέγει** is personal or impersonal; and whether, if personal, **ὁ Θεός**, or **ἡ γραφή**, or **τὸ πνεῦμα** is to be understood. OT quotations are usually introduced by the personal term in such forms as **ὁ προφήτης λέγει** (Acts ii. 17), **ἡ γραφὴ λέγει** (Rom. x. 17), **Ἡσαΐας λέγει** (Rom. x. 16, 20), **Μωυσῆς λέγει** (Rom. x. 19), **Δαβὶδ λέγει** (Rom. iv. 6), **ἡ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη λέγει** (Rom. x. 6). Sometimes, again, passive forms are used, **γέγραπται** (Rom. x. 15), **μαρτυρεῖται** (Heb. vii. 17), etc. In other cases the simple **φησί** (1 Cor. vi. 16; Heb. viii. 15), **εἴρηκε** (Heb. iv. 4), or **λέγει** (Gal. iii. 16; 2 Cor. vi. 2; Eph. v. 8, v. 14) is used; and in one case the **λέγει** is introduced as continuing **γέγραπται** (Rom. xv. 10). Some, therefore, hold that, in cases like the present, **λέγει** is impersonal, = "it is said," as **φησί** is used impersonally in Attic (Abb.; *cf.* Light. on Gal. iii. 16). As the NT, however, makes a very limited use of impersonal verbs of any kind, most take these undefined verbs by which quotations are introduced as personal, and so it is with **λέγει** here. The subject to be supplied must be the one most readily suggested by the context; and here, as in most cases, that will be neither **ἡ γραφή** nor **τὸ Πνεῦμα**, but **ὁ Θεός**. The full formula **λέγει ὁ Θεός** occurs in Acts ii. 17, and is implied in the **πάλιν τινὰ ὁρίζει ἡμέραν, "Σήμερον," ἐν Δαυεὶδ λέγων** of Heb. iv. 7. It is also confirmed in some degree by the analogous mention of the *Holy Ghost* in Heb. x. 15 (*cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 656; Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 75).—**Ἀναβὰς εἰς ὕψος**: *when He ascended on high.* In the Psalm the victorious Subject is addressed in the second person; here the "Thou" becomes "He". In the Psalm the ascent expressed by עָלִיתָ לַמָּרוֹם (= "Thou hast gone up to the height") is the triumphant ascent of the God of Israel to *Zion*, the place of His earthly rest, or (better) to heaven His proper habitation, after the victory He achieved for His people. Here it is the ascension of Christ to the right hand of God (*cf.* Acts ii. 33). The aor. part. has its most proper temporal orce, denoting something that preceded the main event in view. It means here, therefore, that Christ's ascension had taken place *before* He distributed the gifts of grace.—**ᾐχμάλωτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν**: *He led captivity captive.* In the original שָׁבִיתָ שֶׁבִי, the abstract **αἰχμαλωσίαν** (= "a body of captives") chosen according to a familiar usage (*cf.* Num. xxxi. 12; 2 Chron. xxviii. 11; see Win.-Moult., p. 282), instead of the concrete **αἰχμαλώτους** ("captives"), adds to the force of the sentence. The verb **αἰχμαλωτεύω** belongs to late Greek; it is pretty freely used in the LXX and the Apocrypha. The phrase is a general one, meaning nothing more than that He *made captives* (*cf.* Judges v. 12), and suggesting nothing as to who these captives were. Neither in the Psalm nor in Paul's use of it here is there anything to warrant the idea that the captives are the *redeemed* (Theod.), or *men in the bonds of sin on earth* (Harl.), or *souls detained in Hades* (Est., König, Delit., etc.). The most that the words themselves, or passages more or less analogous (1 Cor. xv. 25, 26) warrant us to say is that the *captives* are the *enemies* of Christ; just as in the Psalm they are the enemies of Israel and Israel's God. But these are left quite undefined, and the whole idea of the clause is subordinate to that next expressed, *viz.*, the giving of the gifts.—**καὶ ἔδωκε δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις**: *and gave gifts unto men.* The **καί** of the TR is found in BC^{2}א^{3}D^{3}KL, etc.; but is omitted in א*AC^{2}D*G, 17, etc. It is put in brackets by WH, and omitted by LT, but retained (on the whole rightly) by RV. Here the quotation diverges widely, both from the original Hebrew, which has לָקַחְתָּ מַתָּנוֹת בָּאָדָם (= "Thou hast received gifts among men"); and from the LXX which renders it **ἔλαβες δόματα ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ** (or **ἀνθρώποις**). The idea in the Psalm is that of Jehovah, the Conqueror, *receiving* gifts, that is to say, *gifts of homage*; or, possibly, receiving the captured men themselves regarded as gifts or offerings, the בָּאָדָם being capable of that sense (*cf.* Ewald, *Aus. Lehrb. d. Hebr. Sprache*, § 287 *h*). The idea expressed here is that of the ascended Christ *giving* gifts to men; **ἔδωκε** being substituted for **ἔλαβες**, and **τοῖς ἀνθρώποις** for the generic **ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ** (or **ἐν ἀνθρώποις**).—Thus in order to suit the purpose of a testimony to the statement made regarding Christ and the gift of grace, the OT passage is materially changed. OT quotations introduced in the NT are given without much regard to the literal faithfulness with which

μαλωσίαν καὶ ἔδωκεν [d] δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.[1] 9. τὸ δὲ ἀνέβη, [d] Matt. vii. 11 || Luke; Phil. iv. 17 only.
τί ἐστιν εἰ μὴ ὅτι καὶ [e] κατέβη[2] εἰς τὰ [f] κατώτερα[3] τῆς γῆς; [e] = Rom. x. 7. [f] Here only; Ps. lxii. 9.

[1] εν ανθρωποις FG, Orig., Euseb., Hil., Jer., etc.

[2] After κατ. insert πρωτον ℵ[3]BC[3]KLP, al., Vss., Thdrt., Dam., Ambrst.-ms., Oec.-comm.; προτερον 120; ℵ*AC*DEFGO 17, 46, 67[2], 43, al., It., am., Copt., Sahid., Eth., Thdrt., Cyr., Chr.-comm., Oec.-text, Iren., Lucif., Hil., Jer., Aug., al.

[3] After κατ τ. insert μερη with ℵABCD[3]KLP, etc., vss. Orig.$_1$, all Aug.$_2$, al.; om. DEFG, d, e, g, Syr., Ar.-erp., Thdrt., Orig.$_1$, Iren.$_2$, Tert., Lucif., Hil., Ambrst., Jer.; κατωτατα Thdrt., Orig., Euseb., Cyr.

quotations are expected to be made in modern times; and in other passages made use of by Paul (*e.g.*, Rom. x. 6-10) we discover a remarkable liberty both in reproduction and in application. But in none is the change so great as in the present case. There is first the departure from the historical meaning of the Psalm; in which, however, this passage stands by no means alone. The Psalm in which this magnificent description of the victorious march of Israel's God occurs, celebrates the establishment of Jehovah's kingdom in the past and proclaims the certainty of its triumph over all enemies and in all nations in the future. It does this in connection with some great event in the history of Israel. All possible opinions have been expressed as to the particular occasion of the Psalm. It has been identified with the removal of the Ark to Zion in David's time (2 Sam. vi. 12, etc.; 1 Chron. xv.); with some unnamed victory of David or with David's victories generally; with the placing of the Ark in Solomon's Temple; with the victory of Jehoshaphat and Jehoram over Moab (2 Kings iii.; Hitzig); with the check given to the Assyrians in Hezekiah's time; with the consecration of the Temple of the Restoration (Ewald); with the return from the captivity (Hupfeld); with the struggle between Egypt and Syria for the possession of the Holy Land towards the close of the third century B.C.; with the victories of Jonathan or Simon in the Maccabean wars (Olsh.); with the struggle between Ptolemy Philometor and Alexander Balas (1 Macc. xiv.), etc. But all this uncertainty as to the particular date and occasion does not affect the fact that what is dealt with is some great passage in the history of the Jewish nation. The probabilities are that the Psalm belongs to the latter part of the Babylonian exile; but Paul passes by the actual historical intention of the words and puts on them a quite different sense. There is, *secondly*, the notable change from Jehovah *receiving* gifts to Christ *giving* gifts. Some have explained this by supposing that Pau followed a Hebrew text which read נתת, or some such form, instead of לקחת; but of this there is no evidence. It is possible, indeed, that the Apostle adopted a *traditional* version or interpretation of the passage which was familiar, and of which some indication is found in the Peshitta Syriac and the Chaldee Paraphrase (both having a rendering = "Thou didst give gifts to the children of men"). Something also may be said in support of the explanation that the לָקַח of the original, which is used elsewhere in the sense of *fetching* or taking *in order to give* (Gen. xviii. 5, xxvii. 13, xlii. 16, xlviii. 9, etc.), has that meaning here. But after all such explanations the fact remains that both the terms and the idea are changed. There is *thirdly* the Messianic interpretation. It is here that the justification of the change is found. The Psalm, there is good reason to believe, had been regarded as a Messianic Psalm; and the use made of it by Paul was in all probability in accordance with views of Messianic prophecy which had become current, and with a method of dealing with the OT which was generally understood. But in any case it is an *application* rather than an *interpretation* in the strict sense of the word that we have here. And the justification of such an application lies in the fact that the unknown event celebrated in the Psalm was a victory of the Theocratic King, and in that sense a part of that triumph of the Kingdom of God which was to be carried to its consummation by the Messiah.

Ver. 9. **Τὸ δέ, ἀνέβη, τί ἐστιν εἰ μὴ ὅτι καὶ κατέβη πρῶτον**: *Now this*, "*He ascended*," *what is it but that He also*

descended [*first*]? The TR inserts **πρῶτον**, with B$\aleph^3$C^{3}KLP, most cursives, Syr., Vulg., Goth., Arm., etc. The omission of **πρῶτον** is supported by $\aleph^*$AC*DG, 17, Boh., Sah., Eth., etc. The documentary evidence is pretty fairly balanced. The preponderance, however, on the whole, is on the side of the omission, especially in view of transcriptional probabilities. The word is deleted by LTTr; while WH and RV give it a place in the margin. The **δέ** has its usual *transitional* force, but with something added. It continues the thought, but does that in the form of an *explanation* or *application; cf.* Gal. ii. 2; Eph. v. 3; see also Buttm., *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 303; Winer.-Moult., p. 553. What the precise point of the quotation is, and what the explanation amounts to which is thus introduced, are questions of no small difficulty. The answer will appear when the particular terms have been examined. The clause **τὸ δέ, ἀνέβη** is not to be taken as if Paul were limiting himself to a play upon the word. What follows shows that he had in view the historical fact expressed in the **ἀναβάς**, *viz.*, the Ascension. As in Matt. ix. 3; John x. 6, xvi. 17, the **τί ἐστιν** has the force of—*What does it mean? What is implied in the statement?* And the reply given by Paul in **ὅτι καὶ κατέβη** is that the *ascent* presupposes a previous *descent*. This of course is not given as an inference of universal application, but as one that holds good in the case in view, and one which gives Paul the warrant to use the quotation as he does. In the Psalm it was Jehovah that ascended, but that was only after He had first descended to earth in behalf of His people from His proper habitation in heaven. And so the Giver of gifts to whom Paul desires to direct his readers was One who had first come down to earth before He ascended. It was the belief of those whom Paul addressed (*cf.* the express statement in John iii. 13) that Christ's proper abode was in heaven. That belief is here taken for granted, and the conclusion consequently is drawn that the Giver who ascended is Christ.—**εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς**: *into the lower parts of the earth.* The *locality* or the *extent* of the descent is now defined. The question is whether the locality in view is this world as a scene of existence lower than heaven, or the under world as a deeper depth than earth itself. Does the sentence refer to Christ's *incarnation* and the subjection to which He humbled Himself on earth even unto death? Or does it point to His *descent to Hades?* And if the latter is the case, in what aspect and with what particular significance is His visit to the world of the dead presented? On these questions there has been and there continues to be great diversity of opinion. Both interpretations have large support. That the "lower parts of the earth" mean simply earth itself in distinction from heaven is the view of Calv., Grot., Mich., Winer, Harl., Thom., Reiche, de Wette, Hofm., Beyschlag, Schweitzer, Weiss, Pfleid., Bisping, Abb., Haupt and others. That they mean Hades is the view favoured by the Copt. and Eth. Versions, and by such interpreters as Iren., Tertull., Jer., Erasm., Estius, Beng., Rück., Olsh., Del., Bleek, Mey., Alf., Ell. (on the whole), etc. Those who adopt this latter view, however, are not wholly at one. The great majority indeed, especially among Patristic and Lutheran exegetes, understand Paul to affirm that Christ after His death made a manifestation of Himself in triumph to the world of the departed, and fulfilled a certain ministry there. That ministry is understood by some, especially among the Fathers, to have been concerned with the release of the souls of OT saints from the *Limbus Patrim;* by others, especially among certain classes of modern commentators, to have been a new proclamation of grace to the whole world of the departed or to certain sections of the dead; *cf.* Pearson on the *Creed*, *sub* Art. v.; Salmond's *Christian Doctrine of Immortality*, p. 421, etc. But there are those, especially Calvinistic theologians, who take the writer to mean nothing more, if he refers to Hades at all, than that like other men Christ passed at death into the world of the departed and had experience there of the power of death for a time. Some (*e.g.*, Chrys., Theod., Oec.) are of opinion that the phrase points to the *death* or the *burial* of Christ, but do not press it beyond that. On the other hand, there are those (*e.g.*, Von Soden, Abb.) who take the descent to be to *earth* and not to Hades, but instead of identifying it with the incarnation regard it as *subsequent* to the ascension. What then is the most reasonable interpretation?

It must be said in the first place that neither grammar nor textual criticism gives a decisive answer. The **τῆς γῆς** may be taken equally well as the *appos.* gen., = "the lower parts which *are* or *make* the earth"; the *poss.* gen., = "the lower parts *belonging* to earth," Hades being conceived to be part of the earth, but its lower part; or the *comp.* gen., =

"the parts lower than the earth". But the *comparative* idea is not more pertinent to the one main line of interpretation than to the other. The **κατώτερα** may mean the parts lower than the earth itself, *i.e.*, Hades; but it may also mean the parts lower than heaven, *i.e.*, the earth. Nor does the variety in reading affect the sense, though much has been made of it. The word **μέρη** is inserted after **κατώτερα** by BℵCD^{3}KLP, Syr.-P., Boh., Vulg., Arm., Chrys., etc. It is omitted by D*G, Goth., Eth., Iren., etc. It must be held, therefore, to belong to the text, but it is not inconsistent with either interpretation. The main arguments in favour of *Hades* being in view are these; that if *earth* were meant, it is difficult to understand why some simpler form such as **εἰς τὴν γῆν** or **εἰς τὴν γῆν κάτω** (Acts ii. 19) was not chosen; that the use of so singular a phrase as **τὰ κατώτερα**, which recalls the LXX rendering for תַּחְתִּיּוֹת הָאָרֶץ, one of the OT expressions for the underworld, suggests at once that something lower than earth itself, a yet deeper depth, was intended (Mey.); that the accompanying phrases **ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν** and **ἵνα πληρώσῃ τὰ πάντα**, being expressions of largest extension, make it reasonable to give the widest possible sense also to the **κατώτερα**; and that justice is done to the peculiarity and the amplitude of the various expressions only by taking Paul's idea to be that as Christ rose in order to fill the whole world, He had first to pass in His victorious power through all the great divisions of the universe—heaven above, earth beneath, and even the subterranean world, in the assertion of His universal sovereignty. But there is much to be said on the other side. The superlative formula **τὰ κατώτατα** would have been more in point if the idea to be expressed had been that of a depth than which there was none deeper (Abb.), or that of a descent embracing all the several parts of the universe. In point of fact, too, it is not **τὰ κατώτερα**, but **τὰ κατώτατα**, that the LXX employs in reproducing the Hebrew תַּחְתִּיּוֹת הָאָרֶץ. If *Hades* had been intended, it is strange that Paul did not select one or other of the more familiar and quite unambiguous phrases which are used elsewhere, *e.g.*, **ἕως ᾅδου** (Matt. xi. 23), **εἰς ᾅδου** (Acts ii. 27), or such a formula as **εἰς τὴν καρδίαν τῆς γῆς** (Matt. xii. 40), **εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον** (Rom. x. 7). It is also to be considered that, granting it is the *Ascension* and not merely the *Resurrection* of Christ that is expressed by the **ἀνέβη**, it was not from Hades, but from earth that He did ascend. Further, the point immediately in view is not any work that Christ did in the world and its several parts, but the identity of the Person who descended, and ascended, and gave gifts. This is made sufficiently clear by the repeated **αὐτός** (vv. 10, 11), and the idea of a Hades-visit or a Hades-ministry has no obvious relation to that. The great paragraph in Phil. ii. 5-10, which is in some sense a parallel, has also to be taken into account. There again the whole statement turns upon the two great ideas of the incarnation with the humiliation involved in it and the exaltation, and nothing is said about any visit of Christ to the underworld. Here, too, the whole idea of a descent to Hades appears to be foreign to the thought. It is not suggested by the passage in the Psalm; for there is not a word about Sheol in it. Neither is there any indication of it in the context in the Epistle. For there the bestowal of gifts is referred not to Christ's descent, but to His ascension, and no hint is given of any work done by Him in Hades with a view to that bestowal, or of any relation in which the world of the dead stands to His prerogative of *giving*. For these reasons we conclude that the phrase **τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς** means the *earth* as a scene of existence, lower than His native heavens, to which Christ descended.

Ver. 10. **ὁ καταβάς, αὐτός ἐστι καὶ ὁ ἀναβάς**: *he that descended, he it is that also ascended* (or, *he himself also ascended*). It was the first thought of every Christian mind that Christ had come down from heaven to live and work among men on earth for their salvation. Founding on this Paul declares that He who descended, whom all knew to be Christ, He and no other was also the Person who ascended. So he reminds his readers of the source of all the gifts in operation in the Church or enjoyed by individual Christians—the ascended Christ. A peculiar force is claimed by some (Von Soden, Abb., Bruston) for the **καί** in **καὶ κατέβη**. It is argued that it represents the descent as *subsequent* to the ascent, and contemporaneous with the giving of the gifts. So the point is taken to be this—that the ascent would have been without a purpose unless it had been followed by a descent. This, it is thought, is the reason why Paul pauses to say that the ascending implied also a descending and that the Person in

g Ch. i. 21 reff. 10. ὁ καταβὰς αὐτός ἐστιν καὶ ὁ ἀναβὰς [g] ὑπεράνω πάντων [1] τῶν
h Acts ii. 2, v. 28; = Rom. xv. 13. οὐρανῶν, ἵνα [h] πληρώσῃ [2] τὰ πάντα. 11. καὶ αὐτὸς [i] ἔδωκεν τοὺς
i Ch. i. 22 reff.

[1] Omit, P 113 Thdrt., Euseb. [2] πληρ. εαυτω 47.

view not only ascended but also descended. Hence what is in the writer's mind here is held not to be the incarnation or humiliation of the pre-existent Christ, but the descent of the exalted Christ to His Church, supposed to be referred to also in such passages as ii. 17, iii. 17, v. 31, 32. But it is nowhere taught in the Pauline Epistles that a descent or a departure from heaven after the exaltation was necessary in order that the ascended Lord might bestow gifts upon His Church. The passages cited do not bear out any such idea. The first (ii. 17) does not refer to a coming of the glorified Christ; the second (iii. 17) speaks only of the spiritual presence of Christ in the heart; and the third (v. 31, 32) deals obviously with a "mystery" of *relations*, and has nothing to do with any coming of Christ out of heaven following on His ascension or required for the bestowal of His gifts. Nor is there any reason why the **καί** should have more than the familiar *additive* force.—**ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν**: *up above all the heavens.* So in Heb. vii. 27 our High Priest is described as **ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος.** There may be an allusion here to the Jewish ideas of a gradation of heavens, a series of *three* or, as the case rather appears to stand, *seven* heavens, with which the Pauline **τρίτος οὐρανός** (2 Cor. xii. 2) may also be connected; on the conceptions of a plurality of heavens which prevailed among the Jews, the Babylonians and other ancient peoples, see the writer's article on "Heaven" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible.* But the point of the phrase as we have it here is simply this—that whatever heavens there are or may be, Christ is above them all. So high has His ascension carried Him. It means the highest possible exaltation—the supremacy of One who shares in the sovereignty of God. For the term **ὑπεράνω** see on i. 21.—**ἵνα πληρώσῃ τὰ πάντα**: *that He might fill all things.* The use of the conj. with **ἵνα** after a past tense may be due to the fact that the "filling" is to be viewed as a continuous action (Ell., Alf.; *cf.* Klotz, *Devar.*, ii., p. 618), if it is not to be explained simply by the laxer employment of the conj. in NT Greek. The sense of *fulfilling* or *completing* has been given by many to the **πληρώσῃ.** Thus the idea has been taken by some to be that of the fulfilling of *prophecy* (Anselm, etc.), the *accomplishment* of all things that Christ had to do in His redeeming mission (Rück.), the *making of all perfect* (Oltr.), etc. But, as in i. 23, the verb has the sense of *filling*, and **τὰ πάντα** is to be taken again in its widest application, and is not to be restricted to the world of *believers* or to the Church of Jew and Gentile (Grot., Schenk., etc.). Nor is there anything to suggest that the *ubiquity* of Christ's body is in view, as some Lutherans have argued (Hunn., Calov., etc.). The idea that is in the paragraph is not that of a "diffused and ubiquitous corporeity," as Ellicott well expresses it, but that of a "pervading and energising omnipresence". The thought is the larger one that the object of Christ's ascension was that He might enter into regal relation with the whole world and in that position and prerogative bestow His gifts as He willed and as they were needed. He was exalted in order that He might take kingly sway, fill the universe with His activity as its Sovereign and Governor, and His Church with His presence as its Head, and provide His people with all needful grace and gifts. In OT prophecy to "fill heaven and earth" is the note of Deity (Jer. xxiii. 24).—We may be in a position now to determine Paul's object in introducing the passage from Ps. lxviii. and in applying it as he does. The general connection is clear enough. He bids his readers study lowliness, forbearance and unity, because there is one faith, one baptism, etc. They are not to be vexed or divided because one may have more of the gift of grace than another. All receive from Christ, each in his own way and measure as Christ wills; for, as the Psalm shows, all gifts come from Him. Now some take the point of the quotation to be this—He who is the subject of the Psalm is One whose seat is in heaven, a Sovereign Giver of gifts (Ell.). Others are of opinion that the words are cited in order to bring out the fact that Christ's bestowal of gifts "stands in necessary connection with His general position of

μὲν [k] ἀποστόλους, τοὺς δὲ [k] προφήτας, τοὺς δὲ [l] εὐαγγελιστὰς, τοὺς k Ch. iii. 5 reff.
δὲ [m] ποιμένας καὶ [n] διδασκάλους, 12. πρὸς τὸν [l] [o] καταρτισμὸν τῶν l Acts xxi. 8; 2 Tim. iv. 5. m John x. 2, etc., but=here only; see Jer. iii. 15; Ezek. xxxiv. passim. n Acts xiii. 1 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29; 2 Tim. iv. 3; Heb. v. 12; James iii. 1. o Here only.

[1] Omit τον 1, 109, 114, 121, 178.

filling the whole universe" (Mey.). But the case appears to be less involved than that, and to turn simply on the identification of the Person who is the source of the gifts. Paul has spoken of the grace as *given* (ἐδόθη, ver. 7), and he has quoted the words of the Psalm which say that "he gave gifts" (ἔδωκεν δόματα, ver. 8). But he has not *named* the Giver. Now he explains that the Giver is Christ; and that this is indicated by the Psalm itself, because it sings of One who went up on high, and of an ascent which presupposed a previous descent. Thus he identifies the subject of the Psalm with Christ; as elsewhere the Jehovah of the Prophets and the Psalms is identified with the Christ of the Apostles, and what is affirmed of the former in the OT is ascribed to the latter in the NT.

Ver. 11. **καὶ αὐτὸς ἔδωκε τοὺς μὲν ἀποστόλους**: *and He gave some Apostles.* That is, "He gave some *as* Apostles," or (with RV) "some *to be* Apostles". At this point Paul reverts to the statement in ver. 7, and having shown that the declaration in Ps. lxviii. applies to Christ, he proceeds to set forth the purpose (ver. 12) with which the gifts of the exalted Giver are bestowed and His grace given to such. But before he explains that purpose he specifies a series of gifts given with that in view. We have a somewhat similar enumeration in 1 Cor. xii. 28. But while the ruling idea there is that of *appointments* (ἔθετο) and the subject is *God*, here the particular idea is that of *gifts* (ἔδωκε) and the subject is Christ. Further, while the list in Ephesians begins with *Apostles*, *prophets*, *evangelists*, *teachers*, and continues in terms of *persons*, the statement in 1 Cor. takes note indeed of *Apostles*, *prophets*, and *teachers*, but thereafter passes from *persons* to *gifts* or *ministries*—miracles, healings, helps, governments, tongues. This has its significance, as we shall see. The **αὐτός** is again emphatic, = "he himself," "he and no other". The **ἔδωκε** is not to be taken as = **ἔθετο**, *appointed* or *set*. That it has proper sense of *gave* is clear from its relation to the preceding **ἔδωκε δόματα**. The "giving" refers to the *call* of the Church's Head, the point being the gift of Christ to the Church in the form of certain men chosen by Him and equipped by Him to do service toward the building up of His body and the bringing of all its members to the measure of the stature of His fulness. Further, the exhortation to unity (ver. 3) is still in view, Christ having given these "Apostles" and others in order that all His disciples may come to the unity of the faith (ver. 13). All through the statement, too, the primary thing is the *persons*, not the offices. Nothing is said of any special order or orders in the Church possessing exceptional prerogatives, or any office or rank to which peculiar or exclusive powers of grace were attached. The *men* are Christ's gifts to the Church and to every member of it; and they are given to do a certain work looking to a great end, *viz.*, to furnish His people and every individual believer among them (vv. 7, 16) for their particular service and their particular contribution to the building up of Christ's body. Nothing is said of the *time* when these gifts were given. But as they are the gifts of the exalted Christ, it is plain that the **ἀποστόλους** are not to be restricted to the original Twelve, but are to be taken in the wider sense, including not only Paul, but Barnabas (Acts xiv. 4, 14), probably James (1 Cor. xv. 7; Gal. i. 19), Silvanus (1 Thess. ii. 6), perhaps also Andronicus and Junias (Rom. xvi. 7). The "Apostle" is described as one called by Christ (Gal. i. 1); one who has seen Christ and been a witness of His resurrection (1 Cor. ix. 1, 2; Acts i. 8, 21-23); one whose "signs" were "wrought . . . by signs, and wonders, and mighty works" (2 Cor. xii. 12); whose office also was not limited to a single church or locality, but was related to the world generally and to all the churches (Matt. xxviii. 10; 1 Cor. xi. 28). See also on chap. i. 1.—**τοὺς δὲ προφήτας**: *and some as prophets.* These are referred to along with the Apostles also in ii. 20, iii. 5, and in 1 Cor. xii. 28. With NT prophets we have also NT prophetesses. Agabus, those of Antioch Judas and Silas, the four daughters o Philip, are mentioned as having the gift of prophecy. As in the case of Agabus

p q Here only. ἁγίων, εἰς [p] ἔργον [q] διακονίας,[1] εἰς [r] οἰκοδομὴν τοῦ [s] σώματος τοῦ
q = Rom. xi. 13. [s] χριστοῦ, 13. [t] μέχρι [u] καταντήσωμεν[2] [v] οἱ[3] [v] πάντες [u] εἰς τὴν
r = Rom. xiv. 19, xv. 2; Paul only. s = 1 Cor. xii. 27; Col. ii. 17. t Constr., here only; see Mark xiii. 30. u Acts xvi. 1; 1 Cor. xiv. 36; Phil. iii. 11; = Paul only. v 1 Cor. x. 17; 2 Cor. v. 10; Gal v. 14; Phil. ii. 21; Paul only; τὰ πάντα passim.

[1] Insert της before διακονιας D*FG.

[2] καταντησομεν 44-8, 72, 113, 219, Chr.; καταντησωμεν Clem., Orig., etc.; καταντησω FG.

[3] οι om. DFG, Clem.$_1$, Orig.$_1$.

this gift of prophecy included the prediction of events (Acts xi. 28, xxi. 10), but its chief function was edification. The prophets were preachers or exhorters, to whom revelations of spiritual truth were imparted, and who spoke in the Spirit (ἐν πνεύματι; Eph. iii. 5; Apoc. i. 10), but not in ecstacy or as one in a trance (ἐν ἐκστάσει, Acts x. 10, xxii. 17). Further, he was usually, if not always, itinerant. This order of prophets continued to have a place in the Church for a considerable period. Large mention is made of it in the *Didaché*, and in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, v., 17, reference is made to Quadratus and Ammia in Philadelphia. This may take the order on to Hadrian's time; *cf.* Selwyn, *The Christian Prophets*, and Gwatkin's article in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, iv., p. 127. See also on ii. 20 above.—**τοὺς δὲ εὐαγγελιστάς**: *and some as evangelists.* In 1 Cor. xii. 28 the *evangelist* is not mentioned. Here he is distinguished from the *Apostle* and the *prophet* and named as the third in the order of Christ's gifts to the Church. The **εὐαγγελιστής** is mentioned only twice again in the NT, *viz.*, in Acts xxi. 8, where Philip, one of the seven deacons is so designated; and 2 Tim. iv. 5, where Timothy is charged to "do the work of an evangelist". Like the *prophets* the *evangelists* were generally itinerant preachers or missionaries, though sometimes they had a stated place of abode or ministry. The term seems, therefore, to belong to the Pauline vocabulary. These *evangelists* were inferior to the Apostles, assisting them or delegated by them, but without their authority. They had the gift (**χάρισμα**) of the Spirit, as in the case of Timothy (1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6); but, if we may judge by Philip's case (Acts viii. 5-18), they could not impart the Holy Ghost. Nor do they seem to have had the special revelations which were given to the prophets.—**τοὺς δὲ ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους**: *and some as pastors and teachers.* The **ποιμένες** and **διδάσκαλοι** are distinguished from the former orders as being connected with particular churches, resident and not missionary or itinerant. The absence of the **τοὺς δέ** before **διδασκάλους** indicates also that the **ποιμένες** and the **διδάσκαλοι** were not two distinct orders, but designations of the same men (*cf.* the **πρεσβύτεροι** or **ἐπίσκοποι**; Acts xx. 28; 1 Pet. ii. 25, v. 2), in different functions, the former defining them according to their office of oversight, the latter according to their office of instruction and guidance. The **ποιμήν** would naturally also be a **διδάσκαλος**; but there is not the same reason for supposing that every **διδάσκαλος** would also be a **ποιμήν**. Nothing is said here of **πρεσβύτεροι, ἐπίσκοποι, διάκονοι.** The absence of such official terms points perhaps to the comparatively early date of the Epistle.

Ver. 12. **πρὸς τὸν καταρτισμὸν τῶν ἁγίων**: *with a view to the full equipment of the saints.* The object with which Christ gave some men as Apostles, and some as prophets, etc., is now stated in a sentence consisting of three clauses. The precise construction and meaning of these clauses are by no means easy to determine. The main difficulty is the relation in which they stand to each other and to the preceding **ἔδωκε.** What that relation is will be best seen when the several terms have been examined. The sentence begins with **πρός,** but the two clauses which follow are introduced each by **εἰς.** Little can be made, however, of that. The nice distinctions of the classical period were not maintained in later Greek; and, while Paul's use of prepositions is for the most part remarkably precise, it is his habit to vary them, without any obvious difference in sense. Especially is this his way with those of kindred meaning and followed by the same case: *cf.* **εἰς** and **πρός** in Rom. iii. 25, and see Win.-Moult., pp. 512, 513. The noun **καταρτισμός** occurs only here in the NT; in 2 Cor. xiii. 9 we have **κατάρτισις.** The verb **καταρτίζω** which is found more frequently and expresses

the general idea of making **ἄρτιος**, *fit, complete*, is used in the sense of *repairing* literally (Matt. iv. 21; Mark i. 19), *restoring* in a spiritual or disciplinary sense (Gal. vi. 1), *perfecting* or *making perfect* (Matt. xxi. 16; 1 Thess. iii. 10; 1 Pet. v. 10, etc.), and also in that of *preparing, furnishing, equipping* (Polyb., i., 47, 6; v., 2, 11; Hdt. ix. 66; Luke vi. 40; Heb. x. 5, xi. 3, also Rom. ix. 22, with **εἰς**). The noun, therefore, may well have the meaning of *equipment* here.—**εἰς ἔργον διακονίας**: *for the work of ministration*. **ἔργον** has the simple sense of *business*—the work done in ministration. **διακονίας** is taken by most in the specific sense of *ministerial* service, service of an *official* kind in the Church. But, while this is a very frequent use (Acts i. 17, 25, xx. 24, xxi. 19; Rom. xi. 13, xii. 7, etc.), the word has also the more general sense of *service* (Heb. i. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 11). Its cognates **διακονέω, διάκονος** have also the same sense (Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45; John xii. 26; Acts xix. 22; Phil. 13; Col. i. 25; 2 Cor. vi. 4, xi. 15, etc.). It is quite legitimate, therefore, to give the noun here the non-official sense, if the contest points to that. This also is in harmony with the *anarthrous* **διακονίας.—εἰς οἰκοδομὴν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ**: *for the building up of the body of Christ. Cf.* **πρὸς οἰκοδομήν** in iv. 29, and **πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν τῆς ἐκκλησίας** in 1 Cor. xiv. 12. The two figures of the Church as a *building* and a *body* are combined here. But in what relation do these clauses stand to each other and to the **ἔδωκε**? This is very differently put. Some take them to be three *parallel* or *coordinate* clauses dependent on **ἔδωκε**, as if = "Christ gave some as Apostles, and some as prophets, etc., with a view to these three things—the perfecting of the saints *and* the work of the ministry, *and* the edifying of the body of Christ. So substantially Chrys., Theophy., Oec., Calv., Beng., Klöp., etc., and the AV. To this it is objected that the **εἰς ἔργον διακονίας** would occupy an awkward position, and that the natural order would have been **εἰς ἔργον διακονίας, πρὸς καταρτισμὸν**, etc. With this sense of maladjustment of the clauses some (Grot., etc.) have even supposed a trajection. Others (Lachm., Harl., Tisch., Bleek, Hofm., Mey., Von Soden, Ell., Alf., Abb., etc.) take the second and third clauses, each introduced by **εἰς**, to be parallel to each other, and directly dependent on the **ἔδωκε**. They thus express the *immediate* object, while **πρὸς καταρτισμὸν κ.τ.λ.** denotes the *ultimate* end; as if = "Christ, with a view to the full, final perfecting of the saints, gave Apostles, prophets, etc. for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ". But this gives a somewhat awkward and involved construction, and reduces the force of the third clause, which would naturally be expected to bring us to the larger, ultimate purpose of Christ's giving. Olshausen modifies this interpretation to the effect of taking the second and third clauses as subdivisions of the first, = "Christ gave Apostles, etc., for the perfecting of the saints, on the one hand for the fulfilment of the teacher's office, and on the other hand, as regards the hearers, for edification". But no such distinction is in view here between *teachers* and *hearers*, the subjects being the **ἅγιοι** generally. None of these adjustments of the clauses quite meets the case. The proper construction, recognised so far by Erasm., Luther, De Wette, Rückert, Weiss, and more recently accepted by Haupt, is the simplest. It takes the sentence to be dependent as a whole on the **ἔδωκε**, and understands the three clauses as successive, the first looking to the second, the second to the third, the third forming the climax and expressing the ultimate object of the giving on the part of the ascended Christ. Thus the sense becomes—"Christ gave some men as Apostles, some as prophets, etc., with a view to the full equipment of the saints for the work of ministration or service they have each to do in order to the building up of the body of Christ". The building up of the Church—that is the great aim and final object; to that every believer has his contribution to make; and to qualify all for this is the purpose of Christ in giving "Apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers". In this way each clause fits in naturally with the next, and the ultimate object is expressed last. This, too, is the only construction which does justice to the **ἑνὶ δὲ ἑκάστῳ** at the beginning of the statement (ver. 7) and the **ἑνὸς ἑκάστου** at its close. These are the terms which convey the ruling idea, *viz.*, that each member gets the gift of grace, and each has his part to do towards that upbuilding of the Church which is the great object of Christ's bestowments; and these Apostles, prophets, etc., are the means provided by Christ whereby all the members shall be made capable of performing their several parts in order that at last the whole Church may be built up in its completeness as the body of Christ.

w Ver. 3 only. x Ch. i. 17 reff. y James iii. 2; see Col. i. 28, iv. 12. z Ver. 7 reff. a = Luke ii. 52, xix. 3 only; John ix. 21 b Ch. i. 21.

w ἑνότητα τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς x ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς y ἄνδρα y τέλειον, εἰς z μέτρον a ἡλικίας τοῦ b πληρώματος τοῦ

[1] τ. υιου om. FG, Clem.$_1$, Lucif.

Ver. 13. **μέχρι καταντήσωμεν οἱ πάντες εἰς τὴν ἑνότητα**: *until we all attain unto the unity*. The AV wrongly makes it "come in"; Tynd., "grow up unto"; Cran., better, "come to". But best, "arrive at," or (with RV) "attain unto". The statement of the great object of Christ's gifts and the provision made by Him for its fulfilment is now followed by a statement of the *time* this provision and the consequent service are to last, or the point at which the great end in view is to be realised. It is when the members of the Church have all come to their proper unity and maturity in their Head. The tendency of late Greek to use the subj. without **ἄν**, especially after temporal particles, renders it doubtful whether much may be made of the unconditioned **μέχρι** here. The absence of **ἄν**, however, and the use of the *subj*., seem to point to the event as *expected*, and not as a mere hypothetical possibility; *cf*. Mark xiii. 30; and see Hartung, *Partikl*., ii., p. 291; Hermann, *Part*., **ἄν**, p. 66; Win.-Moult., pp. 378, 387. **καταντάω**, followed in NT by **εἰς**, elsewhere also by **ἐπί**, conveys the idea of arriving at a goal (*cf*. Acts xxvi. 7; Phil. iii. 11), the aor. subj. also having the force of "shall have attained". **οἱ πάντες** evidently refers not to men generally, but to *Christians* and to these in their totality. The article goes appropriately with the **ἑνότητα**, the unity in view being the *definite* unity denoted by the words that follow. —**τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ**: *of the faith and the knowledge of the Son of God*. **τοῦ υἱοῦ** is the *gen. obj*., and it is best taken as dependent on both nouns. Some (*e.g*., Haupt), however, are of opinion that the repetition of the article before **ἐπιγνώσεως** implies that the **τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ** is dependent only on the latter. The **καί** shows that the **ἐπιγνώσεως** is not an epexegesis of the **πίστεως**; and the **πίστις** (here in its usual Pauline sense of trusting, saving faith) and the **ἐπίγνωσις** express distinct, though related, ideas (*cf*. Phil. iii. 9, 10; 1 John iv. 16). The *unity* in view, therefore, is oneness in faith in Christ and oneness also in the full experimental knowledge of Him. The point of the clause is not any unity between faith and knowledge themselves, to the effect, *e.g*., of rising from the former to the latter as a higher Christian endowment (Olsh.), but a unity which shall make all the members of Christ's body at one in believing in Him and knowing Him. The title **υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ** as applied to Christ occurs frequently in the Pauline as well as in the Johannine writings, but never in 2 Thess., Phil., Philem., or the Pastoral Epistles. In passages like the present, if they stood by themselves, it might be difficult to say whether the metaphysical, the theocratic, or the ethical idea is in view. But the analogy of such statements as those in Rom. i. 4, viii. 3, 32; Gal. iv. 4, and the general Pauline conception of Christ as a transcendent Personality, different from men as such, and to be named together with God, point to a relation to God in respect of nature as the force of the designation here.—**εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον**: *unto a perfect man*. **τέλειος**, as in 1 Cor. ii. 6, xiv. 20; Heb. v. 14, and as is suggested by the subsequent **νήπιοι**, means *perfect* in the sense of *full grown*. The state in which *unity* is lacking is the stage of immaturity; the state in which oneness in faith and knowledge is reached is the state of mature manhood in Christ (*cf*. 1 Cor. xiii. 11). The singular **ἄνδρα** instead of **ἄνδρας** is appropriately used (as we have already had **ὁ καινὸς ἄνθρωπος**) when the idea of *unity* is in view. The goal to be reached is that of a new Humanity, regenerated and spiritually mature in all its members. —**εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας**: *unto the measure of the stature*. A clause in apposition to the former, further defining the **τέλειον**, and giving a fuller and yet more precise description of the goal which is to be reached. Is **ἡλικίας**, however, to be rendered *age* or *stature*? The noun appears to have both senses. In Luke xix. 3 it is certainly = *stature*, and probably so also in Luke ii. 52; while in John ix. 21, 23 it is clearly = *age*, and most probably so also in Matt. vi. 27 and Luke xii. 25, altho the latter two are held by some to be referable to the other meaning; *cf*. Field,

χριστοῦ, 14. ἵνα μηκέτι ὦμεν [c]νήπιοι, [d]κλυδωνιζόμενοι καὶ [e]περι- c=1 Cor. iii. 1
φερόμενοι παντὶ [f]ἀνέμῳ τῆς [g]διδασκαλίας ἐν τῇ [h]κυβείᾳ[1] τῶν Paul.
d Here only; Isa. lvii. 20 vat.; Jos., *Antt.*, ix., 11, 3. e=Heb. xiii. 9; Jude 12; Eccl. vii. 8.
f Matt. xi. 7; Jude 12. g (Matt. xv. 9, Mark); Col. ii. 22 Paul only; Prov. ii. 17.
h Here only.

[1] κυβεια AB³CD³EKL, etc.; κυβια ℵB*D*FGO²P, Euthal., etc.

Otium Norv., iii., p. 4. The adj. ἥλικος in the NT has the idea of *magnitude* Col. ii. 1; James iii. 5), and that is its most frequent sense in non-Biblical Greek. Much depends, therefore on the context. The antithesis between τέλειον and νήπιοι favours the idea of *age* (so Mey., Harl., Abb., etc.). But the idea of *stature* is suggested by the μέτρον, the πληρώματος, the αὐξήσωμεν and the αὔξησιν, and is on the whole to be preferred (so Syr., Goth., Copt., Eth. prob., AV., RV., Erasm., Grot., Beng., Rück., Alf., Ell., etc.).—τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ: *of the fulness of Christ.* The πλήρωμα here is taken by some in the sense of *perfection.* So Rück., who makes it "the perfection possessed by Christ," and Oltramare who renders it "the measure of the height of the perfection of Christ". But τελείοτης is one idea, and πλήρωμα another. Not less foreign to the real meaning of the noun are such interpretations as "the gracious presence of Christ" (Harl.); "the perfect age of Christ" (Luth.; *cf.* Calvin's *plena aetas*); "the stature of the *full grown Christ*," etc. Nor can the phrase be taken as a designation of the *Church* (Storr; also Baur, who holds it = that with which Christ fills Himself or is completed, *i.e.*, the Church). For that would give the incongruous idea that we are to *attain to the Church.* The Χριστοῦ is the *poss. gen.*, and the phrase means the fulness that belongs to Christ, the sum of the qualities which make Him what He is. These are to be imaged in the Church (*cf.* i. 23), and when these are in us we shall have reached our maturity and attained to the goal set before us. Thus the whole idea will be this—"the measure of the age, or (better) the stature, that brings with it the full possession on our side of that which Christ has to impart—the embodiment in us the members, of the graces and qualities which are in Him the Head". It has also been asked whether the goal thus set before us is regarded as one to be reached in our present temporal life by way of development, or one to be attained to only in the future life. As between these two ideas the preference must be given (with Chrys., Oec., Jer., Luth., de Wette, etc.) to the former, in view of the general tenor of the exhortation introducing the paragraph, the point of iii. 19, the place given to *unity* and *maturity*, etc. So Mey. thinks it refers to the Christian condition to be reached "after the last storms and before the Parousia". Not a few of the Fathers, however, take the *resurrection* to be specially in view, and interpreters like Theod., Calv., etc., think it looks to the perfected life of the other world. But Paul gives no clear indication of the *time*, and it may be, therefore, that he has in view only the goal itself and the attainment of it at whatever time that may take effect.

Ver. 14. ἵνα μηκέτι ὦμεν νήπιοι: *that we may be no longer children.* Statement of *aim* following on the previous statement of *goal* or *limit.* The verse is regarded by some (Harl., etc.) as connected immediately with vv. 11, 12, and *coordinate* with ver. 13. Others understand it as an explanation of what the *attainment* of the goal spoken of in ver. 13 means. But it is best to take it as *subordinate* to the immediately preceding statement. That is to say, as ver. 13 has set forth the *goal* to be reached and the *limit* put upon the bestowal of the gifts referred to as given by Christ, this verse now gives the purpose which was in view in setting such a goal before us and in giving the gifts of Apostles, prophets, etc. (Mey., Ell., etc.). That purpose looks to a *change* which has to take place in us from the condition of νήπιοι and κλυδωνιζόμενοι to that of ἀληθεύοντες, αὐξάνοντες, etc. The μηκέτι implies something different from the existing condition, and that existing condition, we see, is one of immaturity, assailed, wavering faith, and subjection to the distracting influence of false teachers. In his address to the elders at Miletus (Acts xx. 29) Paul had spoken of "grievous wolves" that would enter the Ephesian Church after his departure. But the statement here is wide enough to apply to the Church generally and not merely to the Ephesians. νήπιοι, literally *infants*

(Matt. xxi. 16; 1 Cor. xiii. 11), and then *minors* (Gal. iv. 1), the *immature* or *untaught* (Matt. xi. 25; Rom. ii. 20; Heb. v. 13, etc.).—**κλυδωνιζόμενοι**: *tossed to and fro.* **κλύδων** means a dashing or surging wave (Luke viii. 24; James i. 6; *cf.* Thayer-Grimm's *Lex.*, *sub voce*); and **κλυδωνιζόμενοι** means tossed about by waves (*cf.* LXX of Isa. lvii. 20). In the changefulness and agitation which were the results of their unthinking submission to false teaching their **νηπιότης** or lack of Christian manhood was seen.—**καὶ περιφερόμενοι πάντι ἀνέμῳ τῆς διδασκαλίας**: *and carried about by every wind of doctrine.* The **ἀνέμῳ** is the *instrum.* dat.; the article **τῆς** denotes that doctrine in the abstract is meant—"every kind and degree of it" (Ell.). **διδασκαλία** means *teaching*, either in the sense of *instructing* (Rom. xii. 7, xv. 4; 1 Tim. iv. 13, 16, v. 17; 2 Tim. iii. 10, 16; Tit. ii. 7), or in that of *doctrine*, the thing taught (1 Tim. i. 10, iv. 6, vi. 1, 3; 2 Tim. iv. 3; Tit. i. 9, ii. 1, 10). Here AV, RV, Ell., etc., take the second sense. "In the fact that now this, now that, is taught according to varying tendencies, there blows, now this, now that, *wind of doctrine*" (Mey.).—**ἐν τῇ κυβείᾳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων**: *in the sleight of men.* For **κυβείᾳ** TWH give the form **κυβίᾳ**. The prep. may be the *instrumental* **ἐν** (so Mey., Haupt, etc.). But the contrast with the following **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** (ver. 15) points rather to the usual force of **ἐν** as = *in* (so Vulg., Copt., etc.), the **κυβεία** being the "*element*, the evil *atmosphere*, as it were, *in* which the varying currents of doctrine exist and exert their force" (Ell.). **κυβεία** means *dice-playing* (*e.g.*, in Plato, *Phaedr.*, p. 274 D), and then *deception, fraud.* Some (*e.g.*, Beza, Von Soden, etc.) give it the sense of *levity*, or *putting at stake*—a shade of meaning occasionally expressed by the verb **κυβεύειν** (*e.g.*, Plato, *Prot.*, p. 314 A). The idea expressed here by the **κυβεία** itself might be simply that of *hazard, unsettlement*, with reference to the *uncertainties* into which the **νήπιοι** were cast by the diverse forms of false teaching under which they fell (*cf.* Haupt). But it is in the character, not of *gamesters*, but *deceivers* that the false teachers are immediately presented (*cf.* Mey.). This "sleight of men" is in contrast with "the faith and the knowledge *of Christ*," or it may be with the pure, sure word of God by which the faith and knowledge of the Son of God came.—**ἐν πανουργίᾳ πρὸς τὴν μεθοδείαν τῆς πλάνης**: *in craftiness with a view to the machination of error.* The renderings of the great Versions show how difficult it is to do justice to this sentence in English. The AV takes refuge in a paraphrase, "and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive". Wicl. gives "to the deceiving of error"; Cov., "to the deceitfulness of error"; Bish., "in craftiness to the laying in wait of error"; Rhem., "to the circumvention of error"; RV, "in craftiness, after the wiles of error". The Vulg. has *in astutia ad circumventionem erroris.* **πανουργία**, used in 1 Cor. iii. 19, of a *false wisdom*, means here, as in classical and also in later Greek, *cunning, knavishness, treacherous deceitfulness.* The **ἐν πανουργίᾳ** is taken by some as a definition of the **ἐν κυβείᾳ**, adding to the idea of *hazard* and *destruction* contained in the latter, the idea of *fraud.* But it is rather a distinct clause, emphasising the dishonesty and trickery of the false teaching. Its authors used all the arts of deception to persuade the **νήπιοι** that their self-made doctrine was the Divine truth. The prep. **πρός** is not to be identified with **κατά** (= *after, according to*), but has its sense of *with a view to, furthering, tending to.* The noun **μεθοδεία** (or **μεθοδία** according to TWH) is nowhere found in the NT except here and once again in this same Epistle (vi. 11), and seems not to occur in non-Biblical Greek, whether that of the LXX or that of the Classics. Its meaning here, however, may be safely taken to be *trickery, cunning arts, treacherous wiles*; as its verb **μεθοδεύω**, which means primarily to *pursue a plan*, whether *honest* (Diod. Sic., i., 81), or *dishonest* (Polyb., xxxiv., 4, 10), came to have the sense of *following craftily*, practising *deceitful devices* (Diod., vii., 16; 2 Sam. xix. 27). The gen. **πλάνης** is usually taken as the *gen. subj.*, = the **πλάνη** which practises craft. But it may rather be the *gen. obj.*, expressing the *object* or *result* of the **μεθοδεία**, = "the cunning art that works to error". The article gives the noun the abstract sense or the force of a personification, = Error. Here, as elsewhere, **πλάνη** has the passive sense of *error*, not the active sense of *seduction*, or *misleading* (Luth., de Wette, etc.). But the question remains as to the precise idea here. The term means properly speaking *error* in the sense of *straying from the way, wandering hither and thither.* That sense is frequent in classical Greek—Aeschyl., Eurip., Plato, etc. In the NT the word is usually said to be used of *mental* error, wrong opinion, as *e.g.*, in 1 Thess. ii. 3; 2 Thess. ii. 11; 2 Pet. ii. 18, iii. 17; Jude 11; 1 John iv. 6.

ἀνθρώπων, ἐν [i] πανουργίᾳ [1] πρὸς τὴν [k] μεθοδείαν [2] τῆς [l] πλάνης,[3] 15. [m] ἀληθεύοντες [4] δὲ ἐν ἀγάπῃ [n] αὐξήσωμεν [n] εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα,

i = Luke lxx. 23; 1 Cor. iii. 19; 2 Cor. iv. 2, xi. 3 only; Josh. ix. 4. k Ch. vi. 11 only, see 2 Kings xix. 27; Polycarp. ad Phil., 7; 2 Macc. xiii. 18. l Matt. xxvii. 64; Rom. i. 27; Prov. xiv. 8. m Gal. iv. 16 only; Gen. xlii. 16. n Ch. ii. 21.

[1] Insert τη before πανουργια FG 39, 116.

[2] μεθοδειαν B^3CD^3E, etc., Chr., etc.; μεθοδιαν ℵ$B^*D^*FGKLO^2$, etc., Euth.; τας μεθοδιας A.

[3] After πλαν. add του διαβολου A. [4] For αληθ. δε, αληθιαν δε ποιουντες FG.

But it is doubtful whether that sense fully meets the case in some of the passages thus cited, *e.g.*, 1 John iv. 6. In such passages as Rom. i. 27; James i. 20, it denotes error in practice, a wrong way of life or action. This seems to be its force here. Consequently the idea of the clause is more definite than "in craftiness tending to the settled system of error" (Ell.). It means "in craftiness, furthering the scheming, deceitful art which has for its result the false way of life that strays fatally from truth."

Ver. 15. **ἀληθεύοντες δέ**: *but truthing it*. A participial clause qualifying the following **αὐξήσωμεν** and introducing the positive side of the change in view as contrasted with the negative aspect of the same in the **μηκέτι** clause. The **δέ** has the force of "but rather" or "but on the other hand". *Opposition* of one thing to another is usually expressed by **ἀλλά**; but the advers. **δέ** is also used at times with that force, with the difference, however, that **δέ** *connects* while it contrasts or opposes; *cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 551. The precise meaning of **ἀληθεύοντες** is disputed. The RV marg. makes it "dealing truly"; but that is a doubtful sense. Calvin takes it = *veritati operam dare*; Rückert, "holding fast the truth"; Ell., "holding the truth"; Olsh., "walking in truth"; Alf., "being followers of truth". But in classical Greek the verb seems to mean to *speak truth* as opposed to **ψεύδεσθαι** (Plato, *Rep.*, p. 589 c; Xen., *Anab.*, i., 7, 18, iv., 4, 15, etc.), and that is its sense also in Gal. iv. 16. It is best to take it here, too, as = "speaking truth"; or more definitely "confessing the truth". The point of this brief, but significant clause, therefore, may be this —these Ephesians had learned the saving truth (**ἡ ἀλήθεια**; *cf.* Gal. ii. 5, 14; 2 Cor. iv. 2; 1 Pet. i. 22; Heb. x. 26, etc.) of Christ. They had been exposed to the treacheries and risks of false teaching. Christ had given them Apostles, prophets, and evangelists to secure them against all teachers of craft, and they are here charged to continue to confess the truth in which they had been instructed and so grow to the maturity of the Christian life. —**ἐν ἀγάπῃ**: *in love*. The question is—to what is this to be attached? It is connected by many (Syr., Eth., Theophy., Oecum., Erasm., Calv., Rück., Bleek, de Wette, Alf., AV, RV, etc.) with the **ἀληθεύοντες**, and it is taken to express the idea that love is the element in which truth is to be spoken (or the truth confessed), if it is to conduce to unity and brotherliness. This construction is supported by the considerations that the simple **ἀληθεύοντες δέ** would be somewhat bald if it stood wholly by itself; that it is natural to associate *love* and *truth*; that the position of **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** *after* the **ἀληθεύοντες** and also the parallel structure of ver. 14 point to this connection; and that we thus get a contrast between **πανουργία** and **ἀγάπη** and again between **πλάνη** and **ἀληθεύειν**. The main argument for connecting the clause rather with the following **αὐξήσωμεν** (= "but speaking truth (or rather, confessing the truth) may in love grow up") is the fact that in ver. 16, where the climax is reached, **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** qualifies the main thought—that of the *growth* or the *edification* of Christ's body. This is a consideration of such weight as to throw the probability on the whole on the side of the second connection (Mey., Alf., Haupt, etc.).—**αὐξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα**: *may grow up unto him in all things*, **αὐξήσωμεν**, which is under the regimen of the **ἵνα**, has here, as in ii. 21 and in various other passages of the NT, the intr. sense of *growing*. In earlier classical Greek it meant to *cause to grow*. That sense it has in the LXX and also occasionally in the NT (1 Cor. iii. 6, 7; 2 Cor. ix. 10), while the pass. is used to express *growing*. But from Arist. onwards it came also to have the *intr.* sense. Meyer takes **εἰς αὐτόν** to mean simply "*in reference* to him". The idea then would be that it is only by being *in relation* to Christ that

o Ch. i. 22 ὅς ἐστιν ἡ °κεφαλὴ, χριστὸς,[1] 16. ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα Pσυναρμολο-
reff.
p Ch. ii. 21 γούμενον καὶ qσυμβιβαζόμενον διὰ πάσης rἁφῆς τῆς sἐπιχορηγίας
only.
q Col. ii. 19 only; Isa. xl. 14 al. r Col. ii. 19 only. s Phil. i. 19 only

[1] ο Χρ. DG, etc.; omit ο ℵABC 17, 67², 73, Bas., Cyr., Did., Dam.

we can grow. But while it is true that the growth which is set before us as our aim depends wholly on our remaining in living relation to Christ, the phrase **εἰς αὐτόν** can scarcely bear this out, but, as restricted by Meyer, would mean only "as regards him". The **εἰς αὐτόν** must have a more definite sense. It might mean "into him" (AV, RV, Ell., etc.), in the sense of becoming wholly *incorporated* in Him, or made one with Him, or in the sense of growing till our life has "its centre *in* Him," as Ell. would put it. But this is an idea difficult to grasp, and not quite in harmony with the conception of Christ as *Head*. For the members to grow *into* the head is not a congruous idea. It is best, therefore, to give **εἰς** the sense of "unto," Christ the Head being the *end* and *object* of the growth of the members. This means more than that we are to grow into *resemblance* to Him, or that our growth is be according to His *example*. It means that as He is the source *from* which (**ἐξ οὗ**, ver. 16) the grace or power comes that makes it possible for us to grow, He is also the *object* and *goal* to which our growth in its every stage must look and is to be directed. This is more in harmony with the previous **εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον** and **εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας, κ.τ.λ.** The *extent* or *scope* of this growing into Christ is expressed by **τὰ πάντα** (the acc. of *def.* or acc. of *quantitative* object.; *cf.* Krüger, *Sprachl.*, § 46, 5, 4), = in all that belongs to our growth; in all the power and circumstances of our growth. The simple **πάντα** is so used in 1 Cor. ix. 25, x. 33, xi. 2. Here **τὰ πάντα** is in place, the idea being, as Meyer rightly observes, the definite idea of *all the points in which we grow*.—**ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή, ὁ Χριστός**: *who is the head even Christ*. With DGKL, Chrys., etc., the TR reads **ὁ Χριστός**. The article is rightly omitted, however, by LTTrWHRV on the authority of the oldest and best MSS., B ℵAC, with Bas., Cyr., etc. Instead of the ordinary form of direct apposition **εἰς αὐτὸν, Χριστόν**, the relative form is adopted, probably with a view both to emphasis, and to definiteness in the connection with **ἐξ οὗ, κ.τ.λ.** Such constructions were usual in Greek of all periods; *cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 665; also 2 Cor. x. 13; Plato, *Apol.*, p. 41 A; Eur., *Hec.*, 764.

Ver. 16. **ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα**: *from whom the whole body*. Statement of the relation of the *whole*, following that already made regarding the several members. **πᾶν τὸ σῶμα** looks back on the **οἱ πάντες**. The **ἐξ** has its proper force of *origin* (*cf.* 1 Cor. viii. 6; 2 Cor. v. 1, xiii. 4, and especially the precise parallel in Col. ii. 19), and cannot be reduced to mean *per quem* (Morus., etc.). All growth in the body has its source in Christ, the Head.—**συναρμολογούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον**: *being fitly framed together and compacted*. Or, as RV, "fitly framed and knit together". The participles are presents, as expressing a process that is going on. For the former see on chap. ii. 21 above. The latter, to which TWH give the form **συνβιβαζόμενον**, expresses the general idea of *putting together*, but with various shades of meaning, *e.g.*, reconciling one to another (Herod., i., 74); *considering* or *concluding* (Acts xvi. 10); *demonstrating* (Acts ix. 22); *instructing* (1 Cor. ii. 16); and (as here and in Col. ii. 19) *compacting* or *knitting together* into one whole. Distinctions have been drawn between the two terms; *e.g.*, by Bengel, who took the **συναρμολογουμένη** to express specially the *harmony* of the building and the **συμβιβαζόμενον** its solidity; and by Ellicott, who thinks the idea of the former is that of the *aggregation* of the parts, and of the latter that of their *inter-adaption*. But at the most the difference does not seem to go beyond the notions of *joining* (**ἁρμός** = a *joint*) and *compacting* or *making to coalesce*.—**διὰ πάσης ἁφῆς τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας**: *by means of every joint of the supply*. Here the AV and the RV are in substantial agreement, the former giving "by that which every joint supplieth"; the latter "through that which every joint supplieth," with the marginal rendering "through every joint of the supply". The Vulgate gives *per omnem juncturam* The old English Versions vary, *e.g.*, Wicl., "by each jointure of under serving"; Tynd., "in every joint wherewith one ministereth to another"; Cov., "every joint of subministration"; Gen., "by every joint for the furniture thereof";

[t] κατ' [t] ἐνέργειαν [1] ἐν [u] μέτρῳ [2] [v] ἑνὸς [v] ἑκάστου [w] μέρους [3] τὴν [x] αὔξη- t Ch. i. 19, iii. 7; Col. i. 29; 2 Thess. ii.
σιν τοῦ σώματος [4] [y] ποιεῖται εἰς [z] οἰκοδομὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ.

9 only. u Ver. 7 reff. v Acts ii. 6 reff. w = Plat., *Legg.*, vii., p. 795 E, ἐλαφρότητός τε ἕνεκα κ. κάλλους τῶν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ μελῶν κ. μερῶν. x Col. ii. 19 only; 2 Macc. v. 16. y Constr., Luke v. 33; Phil. i. 4; 1 Tim. ii. 1 al. z Ver. 12 reff.

[1] **κατ ενεργ.** om. FG, d, e, f, g, Arm., Iren., Lucif., al.

[2] **εν μετρ.** om. K 3, Arm.

[3] For **μερους**, **μελους** AC 14, al., Vulg., Syr., Copt., Arm , al., Cyr., Chrys., Jer., Pel., al.; text ℵBDEFGLO[2], f, g, Syr.-P., Eth., Goth., Bas., Euth., Thdrt., Dam., Ir., Luc., etc.

[4] **του σωμ.** om. K.

Bish., "by every joint yielding nourishment". The clause is one of much difficulty, especially as regards the **ἁφῆς**. The word occurs only twice in the NT, here and in Col. ii. 19. The question is whether it means *joint*, *contact*, or *sensation*. In classical Greek it has a variety of meanings, *e.g.*, *touch* (Aeschyl., *Prom.*, 850), the *sense of touch* (Plato, *Rep.*, 523 E), *grasp* (Plut., 2, 86 F), a *junction* or *joint* in the body (Arist., *De Gen. et Corr.*, i., 8, 24), and also, it is contended, *feeling* (Plato, *Locr.*, p. 100 D, E; *Pol.*, vii., p. 523 E, etc.). In the present passage Chrys. and Theod. give it this last sense, **αἴσθησις**, *feeling*, *perception*; and among others Mey. follows this, rendering the clause "by means of such sensation of the supply" and denying indeed that **ἁφή** ever has the sense of **συναφή**, *vinculum*. But it seems clear that in the passage in Aristotle referred to above and in others, (*e.g.*, Arist., *De Coelo*, i., 11; Plato, *Axioch.*, p. 365 A) it has the sense of *joining*, *juncture*, *joint*. It is also clear that it has the sense of *adhesion*, *contact* (Arist., *Metaphys.*, iv., 4, x., 3; *Phys. Ausc.*, iv., 6; *De Gen. et Corr.*, i., 6). The meaning indeed for which Mey. contends seems to have little or no foundation in ancient Greek use. The choice lies between the other two. The sense of *contact* is preferred by some (*e.g.*, Oec., von Hofm.), the idea then being "by means of every contact which serves for supplying," or "by means of every contact of each member of the body with the power which Christ supplies". But most prefer the sense of "joint," both because all the most ancient Versions understand the clause to have the members of the body and their relation one to another in view, and because in the parallel passage (Col. ii. 19) **ἁφῶν** is coupled with **συνδέσμων**. If the sense of *feeling* is adopted the clause will naturally be attached to the following **αὔξησιν . . . ποιεῖται**, and will specify the way in which the *growth* is to be made. With the sense of *joint* the clause will be best attached to the participles preceding it (especially in view of the clause in Col. ii. 19), and will define the means by which the *framing* and *compacting* are effected. (See especially Light. on Col. ii. 19.) The term **ἐπιχορηγία**, which occurs again in Phil. i. 19, means *supply*, perhaps with something of the idea of the *large* and *liberal*, as Ell. suggests, belonging to the primary use of **ἐπιχορηγεῖν**. The **τῆς** points to the particular supply that comes from Christ, and the gen. may be taken as that of *inner relation* or *destination* (*cf.* **σκεύη τῆς λειτουργίας**, Heb. ix. 21; see Win.-Moult., p. 235). The idea, therefore, appears to be that the body is fitly framed and knit together by means of the joints, every one of them in its own place and function, as the points of connection between member and member and the points of communication between the different parts and the supply which comes from the Head. The joints are the constituents of union in the body and the media of the impartation of the life drawn by the members from the head. Precisely so in Col. ii. 19 the *joints* and *ligaments* are mentioned together and are described as the parts by which the body receives its supplies (**ἐπιχορηγούμενον**) and is kept compact together (**συμβιβαζόμενον**). — **κατ' ἐνέργειαν ἐν μέτρῳ ἑνὸς ἑκάστου μέρους**: *according to an efficiency in the measure of each individual part*. For **μέρους** some good MSS., etc., read **μέλους** (AC, Syr., Boh., Vulg., etc.), and WH give it a place in their margin. But **μέρους** is to be preferred, as supported by such authorities as BℵDGKLP, Arm., etc. **ἐνέργειαν** = *energy* in the sense of *activity*, *working*. **ἐν μέτρῳ** = *in the measure, i.e., proportionate to, in keeping with* (Mey.), or *commensurate with* (Ell.). **ἐν** can never have the sense of **κατά**. But

a = Gal. v. 3; Acts xx. 26 (Paul) only.
b 1 Thess. iv. 1 al. fr.; Paul only.
c Ver. 1 reff.
d Rom. viii. 20; 2 Pet. ii. 18 only; Ps. xxx. 6.

17. Τοῦτο οὖν λέγω καὶ [a]μαρτύρομαι [1] [b]ἐν κυρίῳ, μηκέτι ὑμᾶς [c]περιπατεῖν καθὼς καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἔθνη [2] περιπατεῖ ἐν [d]ματαιότητι

[1] μαρτυρωμαι P.

[2] Before εθν. om. λοιπα ℵABD[1]FGO[2] 10, 17, 47, 51, 67[2], d, e, f, g, m, Vulg., Copt., Sah., Æth., Clem., Cyr., Lat. Fathers; insert λοιπα ℵ[3]D[2, 3]EKLP, most mss., Syr., Goth., Chr., Dam., Thdrt., Thl., Oec.

it is used occasionally like the Heb. בְּ, in phrases expressing the *proportion* or *law in accordance* with which something is done (Thuc., i., 77, viii. 89; Heb. iv. 11; see Win.-Moult., p. 483). The clause is connected by some (de Wette, etc.) with τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας; by others (Harl., etc.) with the συναρμολογούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον; but it is best attached to the αὔξησιν . . . ποιεῖται. So it defines the *nature*, *law*, or *order* of the growth, describing it as proceeding in accordance with an inward operation that adapts itself to the nature and function of each several part and gives to each its proper measure. It is a growth that is neither monstrous nor disproportioned, but normal, harmonious, careful of the capacity and suited to the service of each individual member of Christ's body.—**τὴν αὔξησιν τοῦ σώματος ποιεῖται**: *maketh the growth of the body*. **αὔξησις**, common enough, together with **αὔξη**, in classical Greek, occurs only twice in the NT, here and Col. ii. 19. The Mid. **ποιεῖται** conveys the idea of making *for oneself*; or it may rather *strengthen* the sense, suggesting "the energy with which the process is carried on" (Ell.). See especially Donaldson, *Greek Gram.*, p. 438, for the use of the *appropriative* and *intensive* Middle. The repetition of the **σῶμα**, "the whole body . . . makes the increase of the body," is due probably to the desire to avoid ambiguity, as the pronoun might have been taken to refer to the **μέρους**.—**εἰς οἰκοδομὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ**: *unto the building up of itself in love*. **εἰς** expresses the *object* and *end* of the carrying on of the growth, *viz.*, the completion of the body. The **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** might qualify the **αὔξησιν ποιεῖται** (so Mey.); but it is more fitly connected with the **οἰκοδομήν**, as denoting the ethical element or condition of that consummation and completion of the Church which is the object of the long-continued process of growth.

Vv. 17-24. A paragraph which takes up again the practical address begun with the first verse of the chapter, but interrupted at ver. 4, and contains solemn exhortations to withdraw from all conformity with the old vain pagan life.

Ver. 17. **τοῦτο οὖν λέγω καὶ μαρτύρομαι ἐν Κυρίῳ**: *this I say, therefore, and testify in the Lord*. The **οὖν** has here its simple, resumptive force (*cf.* Donald., *Greek Gram.*, § 548, 31; Win.-Moult., p. 555). It takes up the train of thought which had been broken off at ver. 4. The **τοῦτο** refers to the exhortation that follows. **μαρτύρομαι** is used of a solemn declaration, protest, or injunction of the nature of an appeal to God (*cf* Acts xx. 26, xxvi. 22; Gal. v. 3, etc.). **ἐν Κυρίῳ**, not = *by the Lord*, nor *on the Lord's authority*, but *in* the Lord, the writer identifying himself with Christ and giving the exhortation as one made by Christ Himself (*cf.* Rom. ix. 1; 2 Cor. ii. 17; 1 Thess. iv. 1; also the classical **εἶναι ἔν τινι**, as in Soph., *Oed. Tyr.*, 314; *Oed. Col.*, 247, etc., and Abb., *in loc.*).—**μηκέτι ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν**: *that ye no longer walk*. The exhortation began (ver. 1) as a positive injunction to a worthy walk. It is now resumed in the negative form of an injunction against an unworthy Pagan walk. The **περιπατεῖν**, the ordinary *objective* inf., expresses the object of the ruling verb. After verbs like **μαρτύρομαι** such inf. conveys the idea of what *ought* to be and has something of the force of an imper. (*cf.* Acts xxi. 4, 21; Tit. ii. 2, etc.). It requires no **δεῖν** to be supplied (see Jelf, *Greek Gram.*, p. 884, 4; Buttm., *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 273; Win.-Moult., pp. 403, 405).—**καθὼς καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἔθνη περιπατεῖ**: *as the* [*rest of the*] *Gentiles also walk*. **λοιπὰ** is inserted by the TR before **ἔθνη**, and is supported by ℵ[4]D[2, 3]KL, Syr., Goth., Chrys., etc. It is omitted, however, by Bℵ*AD*G, Boh., Eth., Vulg., etc., and must be deleted here (with LTTrWHRV). The **καί** associates the walk which they are charged to continue no longer with that of the Gentiles generally, and with their own former walk in their non-Christian days.—**ἐν ματαιότητι τοῦ νοὸς αὐτῶν**: *in the vanity of their mind*. **νοῦς** is not

τοῦ νοὸς αὐτῶν, 18. [e]ἐσκοτισμένοι[1] τῇ [f]διανοίᾳ ὄντες,[2] [g]ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς [h]ζωῆς τοῦ [h]θεοῦ, διὰ τὴν [i]ἄγνοιαν[3] τὴν οὖσαν

e = Rom. i. 11, xi. 10 only; Ps. lxviii. 23.

f Ch. ii. 3 reff. g Ch. ii. 12 reff. h Here only. i Acts iii. 17, xvii. 30; 1 Pet. i. 14; Lev. xxii. 14.

[1] εσκοτωμενοι AB, Ath.; אAB 17, etc.; εσκοτισμενοι DEFGKLO²P, mss., appy., Clem., Chr., Thdrt., all.

[2] οντες om. FG 115, Thl.

[3] αγνωσιαν FG.

merely the intellectual faculty or understanding, but also the faculty for recognising moral good and spiritual truth (Rom. i. 28, vii. 23; 1 Tim. vi. 5, etc.). **ματαιότης,** a peculiarly biblical and ecclesiastical term, occurring in NT only here and in Rom. viii. 20; 2 Pet. ii. 18, and corresponding to the Heb. הֶבֶל, שָׁוְא, means *vanity* in the sense of *purposelessness, uselessness.* There is nothing in the clause to restrict it to the case of *idol-worshippers* or to that of the heathen *philosophers* (Grot.). It is a description of the walk of the heathen world generally —a walk moving within the limits of intellectual and moral resultlessness, given over to things devoid of worth or reality (*cf.* Rom. i. 21, **ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν**).

Ver. 18. **ἐσκοτισμένοι τῇ διανοίᾳ ὄντες**: *being darkened in their understanding.* For **ἐσκοτισμένοι** of the TR, with DGKLP, etc., the more classical form **ἐσκοτωμένοι** is given in BאA, etc., and is preferred by LTTrWH. The **ὄντες** is more appropriately attached (with LTTr WHRV, Theod., Beng., Harl., de Wette, Alf., Ell., Abb., Mey., etc.) to this clause than to the following **ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι** (Beza, Rück., etc.). The parallelism of the two clauses is better kept in this way, while the emphasis is thrown first on the **ἐσκοτωμένοι** and then on the **ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι.** The sentence is a further description of the walk of the Gentiles and an *explanation* of its *vanity.* Their walk is what it is because of the condition of moral darkness into which they fell and in which they continue. With **ἐσκοτωμένοι** compare the **ἐσκοτίσθη, κ.τ.λ.** of Rom. i. 21, and contrast the **πεφωτισμένοι** as the note of the new condition in Eph. i. 18. The **τῇ διανοίᾳ** is not to be taken as if this clause referred only to the *intellectual* condition. **διάνοια** covers the ideas not only of *understanding*, but also of *feeling* and *desiring.* It is the faculty or seat of thinking and feeling (Matt. xxii. 37; Luke i. 51, x. 27; Col. i. 21; 2 Pet. iii. 1). The dat. is that known as the dat. of *sphere* or *reference* (*cf.* Bernh., *Synt.*, p. 84; Win.-Moult., pp. 263, 270), or the "local dat. ethically used" (Ell. on Gal. i. 22; Donald., *Greek Gram.*, p. 488).—**ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι**: *alienated.* Being in a state of moral darkness they also become alienated from the true life. The word is used of those who have estranged themselves from God, here and in ii. 12; Col. i. 21 (*cf.* the OT זוּר in Ps. lviii. 3; Ezek. xiv. 5, 7.—**τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ**: *from the life of God.* This cannot mean the *godly life*, the way of life approved by God. For **ζωή** in the NT seems never to mean the *course* of life, but *life* itself, the principle of life as opposed to *death.* The two things are distinguished, *e.g.*, in Gal. v. 25. Nor is there any reference here to the life of the Logos (John i. 3) in the pre-Christian world (Harl.). For it is the **ἔθνη** as they were known to him that Paul has in view here. The **Θεοῦ**, therefore, is best taken as the gen. of *origin* (as in **δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ**, Rom. i. 17; **ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Θεοῦ**, Phil. iv. 7; *cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 233), = "the life that comes from God," the spiritual life communicated by God. Some (Ell., Abb., etc.) think that the phrase means more than this, and indicates that the life thus imparted to us by God is His own life, the very life possessed by Himself, in the profoundest and most real sense "the life of God" in us.—**διὰ τὴν ἄγνοιαν τὴν οὖσαν ἐν αὐτοῖς**: *because of the ignorance that is in them.* Explicit statement of the *cause* of their estrangement, which was implicitly given in the **ἐσκοτωμένοι.** The term **ἄγνοια** again is not a term merely of intellect. It denotes an ignorance of Divine things, a want of knowledge that is inexcusable and involves moral blindness (Acts iii. 17, xvii. 30; 1 Pet. i. 14). It is further defined here not simply as **αὐτῶν** "*their* ignorance," but as an ignorance **οὖσαν ἐν αὐτοῖς**—surely a phrase that is neither tautological nor without a purpose, but one that describes their ignorance in respect of its *seat.* Their alienation had its cause not in something external, casual, or superficial, but *in themselves*—in a cul-

k Mark iii. 5 only ; π. Rom. xi. 25. m ἀπηλγηκότες [1] ἑαυτοὺς [n] παρέδωκαν τῇ [o] ἀσελγείᾳ εἰς [p] ἐργασίαν

l=Luke ii. 4 al. m Here only. n=Rom. i. 24 etc. ; 1 Cor. v. 5 ; 1 Tim. i. 20 ; 2 Pet. ii. 4.
o Mark vii. 22 ; Rom. xiii. 13 al. Jonah i. 8. p=Here only ; Luke xii. 58 ; Acts xvi. 16, 19, xix. 24, 25 only ;

[1] απηλγηκοτες Syr.-P., Clem., Orig., etc. ; αφηλπικοτες FG ; απηλπικοτες DE.

pable ignorance in their own nature or heart (*cf.* the **ἐσκοτίσθη ἡ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδία** in Rom. i. 21).—**διὰ τὴν πώρωσιν τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν** : *because of the hardening of their heart.* This clause, introduced by **διά,** as the former also is, is taken by most (Harl., Olsh., de Wette, Ell., Alf., etc.) to be an independent statement, coordinate with the **διὰ τὴν ἄγνοιαν,** and giving a further explanation of the *alienation.* Such coordination of clauses is somewhat frequent with Paul (*cf.* Gal. iv. 4, etc.). Others (Mey., Abb., etc.) attach it to the former clause, and take it to be a statement of the cause of the **ἄγνοια.** Thus their alienation would be due to their *ignorance,* and this *ignorance* would be caused by the hardening of their hearts. The **τὴν οὖσαν ἐν αὐτοῖς** thus loses its significance, and we should have to regard it as adopted instead of the simple **αὐτῶν** merely with a view to clearness of connection between the **ἄγνοιαν** and the **διὰ τὴν πώρωσιν.** The noun **πώρωσις** means *hardness,* not *blindness.* Formed from **πῶρος** = *hard skin* or *induration,* it means literally *the covering with a callus,* and in its three occurrences in the NT (here and Mark iii. 5 ; Rom. xi. 25) it is used of *mental* or *moral hardening ;* as is also the verb **πωρόω** (Mark vi. 52, viii. 17 ; John xii. 40 ; Rom. xi. 7 ; 2 Cor. iii. 4).

Ver. 19. **οἵτινες ἀπηλγηκότες** : *who having become past feeling.* **οἵτινες** has its usual qualitative or *explanatory* force, = "who *as* men past feeling". The **ἀπηλγηκότες** is naturally suggested by the **πώρωσιν.** It expresses the condition, not of *despair* merely (Syr., Vulg., Arm., etc.), but of moral insensibility, "the deadness that supervenes when the heart has ceased to be sensible of the 'stimuli' of the conscience" (Ell.). A few MSS. (DFG, etc.) mistakenly read **ἀπηλπικότες** or **ἀφηλπικότες,** = *desperantes* (Latt., Syr., Arm., etc.).—**ἑαυτοὺς παρέδωκαν τῇ ἀσελγείᾳ** : *gave themselves up to lasciviousness.* In Rom. i. 26 Paul gives us the other side of the same unhappy fact —**πάρεδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεός.** It is at once a guilty choice of men and a judicial act of God. **ἀσέλγεια** is *wantonness, shameless, outrageous* sensuality (*cf.* 2 Cor. xii. 21 ; Gal. vi. 19 ; 2 Pet. ii. 7, etc.).—**εἰς ἐργασίαν ἀκαθαρσίας πάσης ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ** : *to the working of all uncleanness with greediness.* The noun **ἐργασία** is used sometimes of *work* or *business* (Acts xix. 25) ; sometimes of the *gain got by work* (Acts xvi. 19 ; perhaps also Acts xvi. 16, xix. 24) ; sometimes of the *pains* or *endeavour* (Luke xii. 58). Hence some give it the sense of *trade* here (Koppe, RV marg. = "to make a trade of"). It might perhaps be rendered here "so as to make a *business* of every kind of uncleanness". But it seems rather to be simply = **τὸ ἐργάζεσθαι.** The **εἰς** denotes the *object,* the conscious object (Ell.) of the self-surrender. **πάσης** = every kind of ; **ἀκαθαρσία** is moral uncleanness in the widest sense ; **ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ** describes the condition or frame of mind in which they wrought the **ἀκαθαρσία,** *viz.,* that of *covetousness* or *greediness.* **πλεονεξία** is taken by some to mean **ἀμετρία,** inordinate desire or *insatiableness* (Chrys., Oec., Calv., Trench, etc.). It is repeatedly coupled indeed with sins of the flesh in the NT (1 Cor. v. 11 ; Eph v. 3 ; Col. iii. 5) and is akin to them as they all involve *self-seeking.* But its own proper meaning is *greed, covetousness,* and that sense is quite applicable here. See further on v. 3, 5. These two things **ἀκαθαρσία** and **πλεονεξία** ranked as the two great heathen vices. So the Gentiles, darkened and alienated from the life of God, had become men of such a character that they gave themselves wilfully over to wanton sensuality, in order that they might practise every kind of uncleanness and do that with unbridled greedy desire.

Ver. 20. **ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως ἐμάθετε τὸν Χριστόν** : *but ye did not thus learn the Christ.* **ὑμεῖς,** in emphatic contrast with the **ἔθνη** yet unconverted. The **οὐχ οὕτως** is an obvious *litotes,* suggesting more than is expressed. Meyer compares Deut. xviii. 14. The phrase **ἐμάθετε τὸν Χριστόν** has no precise parallel except the following **αὐτὸν ἠκούσατε.** The nearest analogies to it are the phrases which speak of *preaching Christ* (**κηρύσσειν τὸν**

[q] ἀκαθαρσίας πάσης[1] ἐν [r] πλεονεξίᾳ.[2] 20. ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως [s] ἐμάθετε τὸν [s] Χριστὸν, 21. [t] εἴγε αὐτὸν [u] ἠκούσατε καὶ [v] ἐν αὐτῷ

q Rom. i. 24; Paul only, exc. Matt. xxiii. 27;
Prov. vi. 16. r = Here only; see Col. iii. 5. s Constr., Matt. xxiv. 32, Mark; Rom. xvi. 17; 1 Cor. xiv. 35; Phil. iv. 9; Rev. xiv. 3. t Ch. iii. 2 reff. u Ch. i. 15 reff. v = Ch. i. 15; constr. here only.

[1] For ε. εργ. ακ. π.,—ε . . . θαρσιαν πασης A.

[2] For εν πλ.,—και πλεονεξιας DEFG 39, d, e, f, g, m, Slav. (not rec.), Clem., Ambrst., Aug., Sedul., Pel.-comm.

Χριστόν; Gal. i. 16; 1 Cor. i. 23; 2 Cor. i. 19; Phil. i. 15), the γνῶναι αὐτόν in Phil. iii. 10, and the παρελάβετε τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Κύριον in Col. ii. 6. It cannot = "ye learned the *doctrine* of Christ"; nor can it be taken as = "ye *learned to know* Christ"; for there are no relevant examples of such usages. Χριστόν must be taken as the *object* of the learning, and the form τὸν Χριστόν, especially looking to the following Ἰησοῦ (ver. 21), probably indicates that the *official* sense is in view here. The aor. further points to the definite time of their conversion. The Christ, the Messiah, He personally—that was the contents of the preaching which they heard, the *sum* of the instruction they received and the knowledge they gained then.

Ver. 21. εἴγε αὐτὸν ἠκούσατε: *if indeed ye heard Him.* On εἴγε, = "if so be that," "if as I assume it to be the case," see in iii. 2 above. In the form of a delicate supposition it takes it as certain that they did hear. The αὐτὸν ἠκούσατε is to be understood as the ἐμάθετε τὸν Χριστόν. The pronoun is placed for emphasis before its verb. The point, therefore, is this—"if, as I take it to be the fact, it was He, the Christ, that was the subject and the sum of the preaching which you heard then".—καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐδιδάχθητε: *and in Him were instructed.* ἐν αὐτῷ is not to be reduced to "*by* Him" (Arm.; also AV "taught by Him"), or "about Him," or "in His name" (Beng.), but has its proper sense of "*in* Him". The underlying idea is that of union with Christ. The ἐδιδάχθητε, therefore, refers probably to instructions subsequent to those which were given them at their first hearing (ἠκούσατε). It was *in fellowship* with Christ that they received these instructions.—καθώς ἐστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ: *even as truth is in Jesus.* WH give καθώς ἐστιν ἀληθείᾳ, ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ as a marginal reading. The meaning of the clause is much disputed. That it expresses in some way the *manner* or *standard* of the instructions (ἐδιδάχθητε) is clear from the καθώς. But what the point and connection of the clause are it is by no means easy to determine. Wicl. gives "as is truth in Jesus"; AV and other old English Versions, "as the truth is in Jesus," as if it were ἡ ἀλήθεια. Some dispose of it as a parenthesis (Bez., Rück., etc.), as if = "if ye were so instructed about Christ, that would be false" (as in Him there is only truth, moral and religious truth). Others (Grot., etc.) make it = "as it really is," *i.e.*, "if ye were instructed in the Gospel as it really is in Jesus"; or (Jer., Erasm., Est., etc.) they supply a οὕτως to the ἀποθέσθαι and understand the καθὼς clause to refer to Jesus as the Pattern of moral truth or holiness. Jerome's explanation, *e.g.*, is this—*quomodo est veritas in Jesu sic erit et in vobis qui didicistis Christum.* Somewhat similarly others, connecting it with ἀποθέσθαι, take it to mean that as moral truth is in Jesus, so they on their part are to lay aside the old man (Harl., Olsh., etc.). Or, connecting it with ἐδιδάχθητε, they understand the point to be that they were instructed in a way implying a moral change, as in Jesus there is truth and, therefore, holiness (so de Wette substantially). Meyer makes the ἀποθέσθαι dependent on the καθὼς clause, so that the sense becomes this—"truth it is in Jesus that ye put off the old man"; and Abbott appealing to the use of ἀλήθεια in ver. 24 and in John iii. 21, makes it = "as it is true teaching in Jesus that ye should put off," etc. All these interpretations involve dubious constructions or impose unjustifiable senses on the ἀλήθεια. Feeling this others have adopted the bolder expedient of making Χριστός the subject of ἐστιν, the sense then becoming "as He (Christ) is truth in Jesus" (Cred., Von Soden). A better turn is given to this by WH, who would read ἀληθείᾳ and so get the sense "as He (Christ) is in Jesus in truth". In support of this it is urged that the αὐτόν, ἐν αὐτῷ show that *Christ*, the *Messiah*, is the leading subject. But this construction means that it was not enough to be instructed in a Messiah; that they had

w=John viii. 44; Rom. ix. 1. x See 1 Thess. iv. 14; 1 Cor. iv. 11. y Acts vii. 58; =Rom. xiii. 12; Col. iii. 8; Heb. xii. 1; James i. 21; 1 Pet. ii. 1. z=Rom. ix. 3, 5. a Gal. i. 13; 1 Tim. iv. 12; Heb. xiii. 7; James iii. 13; 1 Pet. i. 15. b Rom. vi. 6; Col. iii. 9.

ὑμᾶς [z]κατὰ τὴν προτέραν [a]ἀναστροφὴν[3] τὸν [b]παλαιὸν [b]ἄνθρωπον [w]ἐδιδάχθητε καθὼς ἐστιν [w]ἀλήθεια[1] [x]ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ, 22. [y]ἀποθέσθαι[2]

[1] Insert η before αληθεια FG. [2] αποθεσθε Eth., Victorin., Pelag., Dam. [3] Omit την προτεραν αναστροφην L.

also to recognise that Messiah in the historical Jesus, and that in Him they would see the life which signified for them a putting off of the old man. There is no indication, however, in the context or in any word of Paul's belonging to this period of a form of false *Christian* teaching which distinguished between *Christ* and *Jesus*, or of Gentiles professing to believe in a Messiah but not in Jesus as that Messiah. It only remains, therefore, to fall back on the interpretation "if ye were instructed according to that which is truth in Jesus". The clause will then describe the *nature* or *manner* of the instruction, as the following clause expresses its substance. In form or character the instruction was in accordance with what was true, with what was true *in Jesus*, that is to say, with truth as seen embodied in Him (*cf.* Alf., Ell.). And instruction of that kind meant that they should put off the old man.

Ver. 22. **ἀποθέσθαι ὑμᾶς κατὰ τὴν προτέραν ἀναστροφὴν τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον**: *that ye put off, as regards your former manner of life, the old man.* This is best connected with the **ἐδιδάχθητε.** It gives the *purport* or *contents* of the instruction. The inf., therefore, is the *objective* inf. (*cf.* in **μηκέτι περιπατεῖν,** ver. 17 above, and Donald., *Greek Gram.*, § 584). It has something of the force of an imperative, but is not to be taken as the same as an imperative, that use of the inf. being very rare in the NT, and found generally indeed only in the case of oracles, laws and the like (*cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 397). In such constructions as the present the *inf.* does not require the pronoun; but **ὑμᾶς** is introduced here with a view to lucidity, after the reference to *Jesus* in ver. 21 (so Ell., Alf., etc.). The figure in the **ἀποθέσθαι** is taken from the putting off of garments, and is parallel to the **ἐνδύσασθαι** of ver. 24. The **κατὰ** clause defines that in respect of which this *putting off* is to take effect, the prep. having here the general sense of "in reference to," not that of "in conformity with". **τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον,** contrasted with the **καινὸς ἄνθρωπος** (ver. 24), the **νέος ἄνθρωπος** (Col. iii. 10), the **καινὴ κτίσις** (Gal. vi. 15), is the former unregenerate self in its entirety (*cf.* Rom. vi. 6; Col. iii. 9).—**τὸν φθειρόμενον**: *which waxeth corrupt.* The pres. part. marks the corruption as a *process* that goes on, a condition that *progresses.* The point is missed by the "is corrupt" of the AV, but is well put by "waxeth corrupt" (Ell., RV); *cf.* also Gal. vi. 8. The "corruption," however, is to be understood as "destruction". The "old man" is in a condition of advancing destruction or ruin, and, therefore, should all the more be "put off". Some (*e.g.*, Meyer) take *eternal* destruction to be in view, the *pres.* part. expressing what is to *issue* in destruction or indicating the *certainty* of the future.—**κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης**: *according to the lusts of deceit.* **ἀπάτης** is the *gen. subj.*, not = "the deceitful lusts" (AV), but = the lusts which deceit uses or which are its instruments. The **ἀπάτη** is in contrast with **ἀλήθεια,** the article giving it the abstract force approaching a personification. **κατά** here = *in accordance with.* The process of corruption or ruin goes on in precise conformity with the nature of the lusts which the deceitful power of sin has in its service.

Ver. 23. **ἀνανεοῦσθαι δέ**: *and that ye be renewed.* For **ἀνανεοῦσθαι** a few MSS. (D^2 17, 47, etc.) and some Versions (Syr., Copt., Vulg.) read **ἀνανεοῦσθε,** while **δέ** is omitted by F. In such connections **δέ** expresses both *addition* and *contrast.* It introduces a statement connected with the foregoing but giving the other side of that. Here it is the positive change which must follow the *putting off.* As the middle of this verb has the active sense, **ἀνανεοῦσθαι** must be taken as passive here, = "be renewed," not "renew yourselves" (Luth.). The verb expresses a spiritual change, a transformation from old to new. Whether it also conveys the idea of *restoration* to a *former* or a *primal* state is doubtful, so many compounds with **ἀνά** (**ἀναπληροῦν, ἀνακοινοῦν, ἀνισοῦν, ἀνιεροῦν,** etc.) expressing nothing more than *change.* For the supposed distinction between

τὸν [e] φθειρόμενον κατὰ τὰς [d] ἐπιθυμίας[1] τῆς [e] ἀπάτης, 23. [f] ἀνανεοῦσ- c = 1 Cor. xv. 33; 2 Cor. xi. 3; Jude 10.
θαι[2] δὲ τῷ [g] πνεύματι τοῦ [g] νοὸς ὑμῶν 24. καὶ [h] ἐνδύσασθαι[3] τὸν

d Mark iv. 19. e Matt. xii. 22, Mark; Col. ii. 8; 2 Thess. ii. 10; Heb. iii. 13; 2 Pet. ii. 13 only, constr., 2 Pet. ii. 10. f Here only; Job xxxiii. 24. g Here only; ν. = Rom. i. 28, vii. 32, xii. 2 al. h = Rom. xiii. 12, 14; 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54; Col. iii. 10.

[1] τας επιθυμιας Clem., Orig., Cyr., Hil., Aug., Jer., etc.; την επιθυμιαν DE, d, e, Tert., Luc., etc.

[2] ανανεουσθε D^2, 10, 14, 17, 31, 33, 37, etc., d, e, f, g, m, Sah., Copt., Syr., Clem., Chr., Cyr., etc.

[3] ενδυσασθε with much the same authorities as ανανεουσθε.

ἀνανεοῦσθαι as expressing *renovation*, making new, or giving a fresh beginning, and **ἀνακαινοῦσθαι** as referring to *regeneration* or change of nature, see Haupt and Ell. *in loc.*, and Meyer on Col. iii. 10.—**τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοὸς ὑμῶν**: *in the spirit of your mind*. The position of the **ὑμῶν** gives it a measure of emphasis, "*your* mind," "the mind that is in *you*," unless it be taken (with Haupt) to be placed last because it qualifies not the **νοὸς** only but the whole idea in **τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοός**. This difficult sentence has been understood to refer to the *Holy Spirit*, the **νοός** being dealt with as some form of the *poss. gen.* or the *gen. subj.*, and the **πνεύματι** as *dat. instr.* Thus the sense would be "renewed by the Holy Spirit *bestowed on*, or *possessed by*, your mind" (Œc., Theophy., Bull, Waterland, Fritz., etc.). This proceeds on the NT doctrine that it is by the Spirit of God that we are regenerated or renewed. But it leaves the point of the addition of **τοῦ νοός** obscure. This ancient interpretation has been adopted by some recent exegetes with certain modifications. Thus Ellicott is of opinion that the **πνεύματι** refers not to the *Holy Spirit* distinctly and separately as the Divine Agent, but to that Spirit as *united with the human spirit*. In this way he thinks the *poss. gen.* is in point, and the introduction of the **νοός** accounted for as the *receptaculum* of the **πνεῦμα**. But, while it is true that it is often difficult to say whether the regenerated mind of man or the Divine Spirit is particularly in view in the Pauline use of **πνεῦμα**, there seems to be no case in which the NT speaks of the Holy Spirit as *man's* Spirit, or attaches to **πνεῦμα** in the sense of the Divine Spirit any such defining term as **ὑμῶν** or **τοῦ νοὸς ὑμῶν**. Nor can it be said that **πνεῦμα**, in the sense of the Divine Spirit in union with man's spirit, has anywhere else any such designation as the one in the text. Nor, again, does the interpretation which turns upon this idea of *union* between God's Spirit and our spirit, and not simply on the *indwelling* of the Divine Spirit in us, really account in any satisfactory way for the **νοός**. It is necessary, therefore, to take **πνεῦμα** here as = *our* spirit, and that as at once distinguished from and related to the **νοῦς**. The **πνεῦμα**, then, appears to be the higher faculty in man, the faculty that makes him most akin to God, the organ of his spiritual life and his fellowship with God, under the bondage of sin by nature, but set free from that and made fit for the purposes of the Divine life by the Holy Spirit. The **νοῦς** (*cf.* on ver. 17 above) is the faculty of understanding, feeling, and determining, distinguished by Paul from the **πνεῦμα** (1 Cor. xiv. 14), represented as capable of approving the law, but incapable of withstanding the motions of sin (Rom. vii. 23), and itself the subject or seat of renewal (**ἀνακαίνωσις**, Rom. xii. 2). Further the regenerate human spirit and the Divine Spirit are described as distinct and yet co-operant (Rom. viii. 16). Here then the **πνεύματι** must be taken not as the *instrumental* dative (for renewal does not take effect by means of our spirit), but as the *dat. of ref.*, and the **νοός** will be the *gen. subj.* Thus the sense becomes "renewed in respect of the spirit by which your mind is governed" (Mey.), that is, in respect of the spiritual faculty, the moral personality whose organ is the mind or reason. Some, holding by the interpretation of **πνεῦμα** as *our* spirit, take the **νοός** to be the gen. of *appos.* (*e.g.*, August., *de Trin.*, xiv., 16, *spiritus quae mens vocatur*), or the *part. gen.*, = "the governing spirit of your mind" (De Wette). But the above construction is better, and it is the one adopted substantially by the AV and the other old English Versions, the RV, Mey., Haupt, Abb., and most commentators.

Ver. 24. **καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν**

i Ch. ii. 15 [i] καινὸν [i] ἄνθρωπον τὸν [k] κατὰ θεὸν [l] κτισθέντα ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ
k 2 Cor. vii. 9, 10, 11 only; see note. [m] ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας.[1]
l Ch. ii. 10 reff. m Luke i. 75 only; Deut. ix. 5 al.

[1] For της αλ., και αληθεια DFG, d, e, g, m, Cyr., Hil., Lucif.

ἄνθρωπον: *and put on the new man.* For **ἐνδύσασθαι** the imper. **ἐνδύσασθε** is read by some authorities of consequence (ℵKB[1]D[2], etc.). The aor. is appropriately used again, as before in ver. 22; "putting off" and "putting on" being acts, while *renewal* (**ἀνανεοῦσθαι**) is a process. For **καινὸς ἄνθρωπος** see on ii. 15 above.—**τὸν κατὰ Θεὸν κτισθέντα**: *which after God was created.* The aor. **κτισθέντα** suggests that the "new man" is regarded here not as a nature created anew for the individual, but as "the holy form of human life which results from redemption," created once for all in and by Christ, and participated in by the individual convert. (See Ell., *in loc.*, and Müller, *Christ. Doctr. of Sin*, ii., p. 392). The phrase **κατὰ Θεόν** has sometimes the simple sense of "godly," "in a godly manner" (2 Cor. vii. 9, 10, 11). Hence it is held by some to mean nothing more here than created "divinely" (Hofm.) or "according to the will of God" (Abb.). But **κατά** is also used to express *likeness* (1 Kings xi. 10; Heb. viii. 8; Gal. iv. 28; 1 Pet. i. 15, iv. 6). Here, therefore, it may mean "like God" or "after the image of God". That this is the sense is confirmed by the use of **κτισθέντα** (which recalls Gen. i. 27), and by the fuller parallel statement in Col. iii. 10: **τὸν νεὸν, τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν.** The clause, therefore, affirms a new creation of man, and describes that creation as being according to the image or likeness of God. It neither states nor suggests, however, that the image of God in which man was first created was lost and has been restored in Christ. What it does state is simply that this second creation, like the first, was in conformity with the Divine likeness or after the example of what God is.—**ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας**: *in righteousness and holiness of the truth.* For **τῆς ἀληθείας** some few authorities give **καὶ ἀληθείᾳ** (D[1]G, Cypr., Hil., etc.). This clause specifies the things in which the new man was created and in which the likeness between him and God consisted. **ἐν**, therefore, denotes the quality or ethical condition in which the creation realised itself. **δικαιοσύνη** and **ὁσιότης** are coupled again in Luke i. 75 (*cf.* also Wisd. ix. 3; Clem. Rom., *First Corinthians*, xlviii., 4). Plato distinguishes in two ways between the idea of **δίκαιος** and that of **ὅσιος**. He defines **δίκαιος** as the *generic* term and **ὅσιος** as the *specific* (*Euthyp.*, p. 12 E); and he describes the former as having regard to our relations to *men*, the latter to our relations to God (*Gorg.*, p. 507 B). The latter distinction is also given by other Greek writers (Polyb., xxiii., 10, 8, etc.). It is not easy, indeed, to say how far this distinction holds good in the NT. But both in profane and in biblical Greek the two words, adjective, adverb or noun, are often combined in one statement (*e.g.*, Plato, *Protag.*, 329 C; *Theaet.*, 176 B; *Rep.*, x., 615 B; *Laws*, ii., 663 B; Joseph., *Antiq.*, viii., 9, 1; Luke i. 75; 1 Thess. ii. 10; Titus i. 8). In many of these cases the distinction between *integrity* and *piety* is certain, and it is suitable to all. The NT also clearly distinguishes between **δίκαιος** and **εὐλαβής** (Luke ii. 25). It may be said, therefore, that **δικαιοσύνη** and **ὁσιότης** are not used vaguely or interchangeably, but that, while both are of grace and both consequently have a new meaning Godward, the former expresses the right conduct of the Christian man more distinctively in its bearings on his fellow-men, and the latter the same conduct distinctively in its relation to God. **τῆς ἀληθείας** is not to be reduced to "true holiness" as in AV, but is to be taken as the gen. of *origin* and as qualifying *both* nouns. Further, **ἀλήθεια** with the article, contrasting with **τῆς ἀπάτης** of ver. 22, seems to be more than Truth in the abstract or a quasi-personification of Truth. It may mean "*the* truth" *par excellence*, the *evangelical* message, the objective truth given in the Gospel (**ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου**, Gal. ii. 5, 14; or simply, as here, **ἡ ἀλήθεια**, John viii. 32, 40, xvii. 19; Gal. v. 7; 2 Cor. iv. 2, xiii. 8, etc.). The creation of the new man in the Divine likeness realises itself, therefore, in something better than the ceremonial rectitude of the Jew or the self-contained virtue of the heathen—in a righteousnes and a holiness born of the new truth contained in the Evangel.

Vv. 25-32. A paragraph containing a

25. Διὸ [n] ἀποθέμενοι τὸ [o] ψεῦδος [p] λαλεῖτε [p] ἀλήθειαν ἕκαστος [n] μετὰ τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐσμὲν ἀλλήλων [q] μέλη. 26. [r] ὀργί- [o] ζεσθε[1] καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε. ὁ ἥλιος μὴ [s] ἐπιδυέτω ἐπὶ[2] τῷ[3]

n Ver. 22 reff. o John viii. 44; Rom. i. 25; Ps. v. 6. p Zech. viii. 16. q Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 27. r Ps. iv. 4. s Here only; Deut. xxiv. 16.

[1] After ὀργ. insert δε PG; και om. Sah. [2] For επι, εν D 3, d, e, f, m, Vulg., etc. [3] τω om. ℵAB, etc.

series of detached, practical exhortations, dealing with certain evils to be forsworn and duties to be fulfilled. These injunctions are all based on the preceding statement, or are delivered as applications of the foregoing charge to put off the old man and put on the new.

Ver. 25. **Διὸ ἀποθέμενοι τὸ ψεῦδος, λαλεῖτε ἀλήθειαν ἕκαστος μετὰ τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ**: *Wherefore, putting off falsehood, speak ye truth each one with his neighbour.* **διό**, with the enlarged forms **διότι, διόπερ**, is rare in the NT except in Luke and Paul, but frequent with these, especially with the latter. It is = *quamobrem, on which account*, and refers here to what was said about the new man and his creation **κατὰ Θεόν** as the ground for what follows. **τὸ ψεῦδος** includes *falsehood* in every form, of which *lying* **τὸ ψεύδεσθαι** (Col. iii. 8) is one chief instance. The partic. has its proper *aor.* force, expressing a thing understood to be done, completely and finally, = "having put off then once for all falsehood in its every form". **λαλεῖτε**, the continuous pres. following on the past act, has the force of "speak truth and speak it continually," as the result of that prior "putting off". The prep. **μετά** is appropriate here as the prep. of personal association and mutual action (Win.-Moult., pp. 470, 471). It is truth in intercourse between Christian brethren (**τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ**), not between Christians and their fellowmen in general, that is in view here (*cf.* Zech. viii. 16).—**ὅτι ἐσμὲν ἀλλήλων μέλη**: *for we are members one of another.* Reason for this practice of truth—a reason drawn not from the common conceptions of duty or social weal, but from the profound Christian idea of union one with another through union with Christ. As in the human body each member is *of* the other in connection and *for* the other in service, so in the spiritual body of which Christ is the Head the members belong one to another and each serves the other; *cf.* Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 15. But can untruth consist with a union in which each is of and for the other? Why the sin of falsehood is first named, and why the sins of anger, dishonesty and corrupt speech are next dealt with, we have no means of determining. The explanation lies no doubt in local and congregational circumstances which Paul did not need to particularise.

Ver. 26. **ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε**: *be ye angry, and sin not.* The words are taken from Ps. iv. 4, and follow the LXX rendering. The original Hebrew, רִגְזוּ וְאַל־תֶּחֱטָאוּ, is rendered by some "Tremble and sin not" (Ewald; AV, "Stand in awe and sin not"), *i.e.*, = "let wholesome fear keep you from this sinful course"; by others, as the LXX gives it (Hitz., Del., etc.). As used by Paul here the words recognise the fact that *anger* has its rightful place and may be a duty, while they indicate also how easily it may pass into the sinful. Great difficulty has been felt with this, and in various ways it has been sought to empty the injunction of its obvious meaning. Some take the first imperative *conditionally*, as if = "if ye are angry, do not sin" (Olsh., Bleek, etc.); others, in a way utterly at variance with the quotation, take **ὀργίζεσθε** as an *interrogative* (Beza, Grot.); others declare it impossible to take the first command as *direct* (Buttm., *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 290), or deal with the first imper. as *permissive*, and with the second as *jussive* (Winer, De Wette, etc.), as if = "be ye angry if it must be so, but only do not sin". Such a construction might be allowable if the first imper. were followed by **ἀλλὰ καί** or some similar disjunctive: but with the simple **καί** it is inadmissible. Both impers. are real jussives, the only difference between them being in the **μή**—which also throws some emphasis on the second. The **καί** has here the rhetorical sense which is found also in *atque*, adding something that seems not quite consistent with the preceding or that qualifies it, = "and yet" (*cf.* Matt. iii. 14, vi. 26, x. 29, etc.). Nor is the difficulty in admitting **ὀργίζεσθε** to be a real injunction of anger anything more than a self-made difficulty. Moralists of different schools, the Stoics excepted,

t Here only; t παροργισμῷ ὑμῶν, 27. μηδὲ [1] u δίδοτε u τόπον τῷ v διαβόλῳ. 28. 3 Kings xv. 30; ὁ v κλέπτων μηκέτι κλεπτέτω, μᾶλλον δὲ v κοπιάτω x ἐργαζόμενος 4 Kings xix. 3 al. τὸ y ἀγαθὸν ταῖς χερσὶν,[2] ἵνα ἔχῃ z μεταδιδόναι [3] τῷ a χρείαν ἔχοντι.

u Luke xiv. 9; Rom. xii. 19; see Heb. xii. 17. v Particip., Gal. i. 23 al. fr. w Matt. vi. 28; Rom. xvi. 6. x Matt. vii. 23, xxvi. 10; Acts x. 35. y Rom. ii. 10; Gal. vi. 10. z Luke iii. 11; Rom. i. 11, xii. 8; 1 Thess. ii. 8 only; Job xxxi. 17. a Matt. iii. 14; Gospels pass.; 1 Cor. xii. 21, 24; 1 Thess. i. 8, iv. 9 al. Paul; 1 John ii. 27, iii. 17 (abs.); Rev. iii. 17 al.

[1] μητε mss. Chrys.$_1$, Thdrt.; μηδε ℵABDEFGKLP, Clem., etc.

[2] ταις ιδιαις χ. το αγαθ. ℵADEFG 37, 57, 73, 116, al.$_8$, it., v., Copt., Sah., Æth., Arm., Bas., Naz., Epiph., Jer., Aug., Pel.; το αγ. τ. ιδ. χ. K 10, 47-8, 71-2, 80, 117, Syr., Thdrt.; το αγ. (omg. τ. χερσ.) 17, 67^2, Clem.$_2$; ταις χερ. (omg. το αγ.), Tert.; al. vary; ταις χερσι το αγαθον ℵB, most mss., Chrys., Thl., Oec.

[3] μεταδουναι DFG.

have recognised the place of *anger* in a moral nature; *cf.*, *e.g.*, Plato's **τὸ θυμοειδές**; Butler's statement of the function of anger in a moral system as "a balance to the weakness of pity" and a "counterpoise to possible excess in another part of our nature," *Sermons*, Carmichael's ed., pp. 126, 128. A righteous wrath is acknowledged in Scripture as something that not only *may* be but *ought* to be, and is seen in Christ Himself (Mark. iii. 5). So Paul speaks here of an anger that is approvable and to be enjoined, while in the **καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε** he forbids only a particular form or measure of anger. As the following clause suggests, even a righteous wrath by over-indulgence may pass all too easily into sin.—**ὁ ἥλιος μὴ ἐπιδυέτω ἐπὶ τῷ παροργισμῷ ὑμῶν**: *let not the sun go down upon your provocation.* For the expression **ὁ ἥλιος μὴ ἐπιδυέτω** *cf.* Deut. xxiv. 13, 15; Jer. xv. 9; also Hom., *Il.*, ii., 413, and Plutarch's statement of the Pythagorean custom—**εἴποτε προαχθεῖεν εἰς λοιδορίας ὑπ' ὀργῆς, πρὶν ἢ τὸν ἥλιον δῦναι τὰς δεξιὰς ἐμβάλλοντες ἀλλήλοις καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι διέλυοντο** (*De Am. frat.*, p. 488 B). **τῷ**, inserted by the TR, is supported by DF KL$\aleph^3$, etc.; it is omitted by the best critics (LTTrWHRV) on the authority of B$\aleph^1$A, etc. The noun **παροργισμός** occurs only here in the NT; never, as it would appear, in non-biblical Greek; but occasionally in the LXX (1 Kings xv. 30; 2 Kings xxiii. 26; Neh. ix. 18). It differs from **ὀργή** in denoting not the *disposition* of anger or anger as a lasting mood, but *provocation*, *exasperation*, sudden, violent anger. Such anger cannot be indulged long, but must be checked and surrendered without delay. To suppose any allusion here to sunset as the time for *prayer* or to night as increasing wrath by giving opportunity of brooding, is to import something entirely foreign to the simplicity of the words as a statement of *limitation*.

Ver. 27. **μήτε δίδοτε τόπον τῷ διαβόλῳ**: *neither give place to the devil.* The **μήτε** of the TR is supported by cursives and certain Fathers, but must be displaced by **μηδέ**, for which the evidence is overwhelming (B$\aleph$DFKL, etc.). **μήτε** properly used would have required **μήτε, μή**, not **μή**, in the previous prohibition. **μηδέ** on the other hand is grammatically correct as it adds a *new* negative clause, = "also do not," "nor yet" (Hartung, *Partikl.*, i., p. 210; Buttm., *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 366; Jelf, *Greek Gram.*, § 776). **τόπον**, = *room, opportunity; cf.* Rom. xii. 19. **διάβολος** is not = *calumniator* (Luth., etc.), as if the reference were to heathen slanderers of Christians (Erasm.), but = *the devil*, the word having always that sense in the NT when used as a *noun* (in 1 Tim. iii. 11; 2 Tim. iii. 3; Tit. ii. 3 it is probably an *adject.*); *cf.* Matt. iv. 1, 5, xiii. 39, xxv. 41, etc. It has that sense again in 1 Tim. iii. 6. The more personal name **Σατανᾶς** occurs more frequently in the Pauline writings, while it is used only once in John's Gospel (xiii. 27) and never in his Epistles. On the other hand **διάβολος** is strange to Mark.

Ver. 28. **ὁ κλέπτων μηκέτι κλεπτέτω**: *let the stealer no longer steal.* Not **ὁ κλέψας**, = "he who stole," but pres. part. with a subst. force (*cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 444). Stealing was not wholly condemned by ancient heathen opinion. It was even allowed by the Lacedæmonians (Müller, *Dor.*, ii., p. 310). It was a vice into which the recently converted living in the old pagan surroundings, especially when unemployed, might all too readily slip. It has been thought strange,

29. πᾶς λόγος [b]σαπρὸς ἐκ τοῦ [c]στόματος ὑμῶν μὴ [c]ἐκπορευέσθω, [d]ἀλλ' [d]εἴ τις ἀγαθὸς πρὸς [e]οἰκοδομὴν τῆς [f]χρείας,[1] ἵνα [g]δῷ[2] χάριν

b Matt. vii. 17, 18; Luke xii. 33, xiii. 48; Luke vi. 43 only. c Matt. iv. 4 (from Deut. viii. 3), xv. 11; Rev. passim; Paul, here only. d = Phil. iv. 8. e = Ver. 12 reff. f Abs., Acts xxviii. 10; see Phil. ii. 25, iv. 16. g = James iv. 6; 1 Pet. v. 5; see Exod. iii. 21; Ps. lxxxiv. 12.

[1] For χρειας, πιστεως DEFG 46, d, e, f, g, Jer., Bas.-oft., Naz., Anton., Max., Tert., Cyr., Hil., Aug., Ambrst., Pel., al.

[2] For δω, δοι DFG.

scarcely credible indeed, that professing Christians in these Asiatic Churches could have given way to thieving. But the Epistles bear witness to the existence of grosser offences against morality in the Churches (*e.g.*, 1 Cor. v. 1).—**μᾶλλον δὲ κοπιάτω**: *but rather let him labour.* **μᾶλλον δέ** has a *corrective* force, = *nay rather, but on the contrary rather; cf.* Rom. viii. 34; Gal. iv. 9.—**ἐργαζόμενος τὸ ἀγαθὸν ταῖς χερσίν**: *working the thing that is good with his hands.* The readings here vary considerably, notwithstanding the simplicity of the statement. The TR adopts the reading given by L, many cursives, Slav., Chrys., etc. In B, am., etc., the **ταῖς χερσίν** precedes **τὸ ἀγαθόν**. This latter with **ἰδίαις** inserted between **τὸ ἀγαθόν** and **ταῖς χερσίν** is found in K, some cursives, Syr.-Phil., etc.; while **ταῖς ἰδίαις χερσὶν τὸ ἀγαθόν** is the reading of AD[1]EFG, 37, etc., Vulg., Goth., Copt., Sah., Eth., Arm., Jer., Epiph., etc. This last is the best, and is adopted by LTTr and by WH in the marg., though not in the text. **τὸ ἀγαθόν** as opposed to the **κακόν** of theft = *labour*, not *idleness; honest work*, not *stealing;* the use of *one's own* hands in toil, not robbing the hands of others. **ἵνα ἔχῃ μεταδιδόναι τῷ χρείαν ἔχοντι**: *that he may have to give to him that has need.* It has been thought strange by some that Paul simply forbids stealing and makes no reference to the duty of restitution. In point of fact he does more than that; for he declares the proper object of all Christian labour (*cf.* Olsh.), *viz.*, to acquire not merely for ourselves and our own need, but with the view of being able to help others.

Ver. 29. **πᾶς λόγος σαπρὸς ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν μὴ ἐκπορευέσθω**: *let no corrupt speech proceed out of your mouth.* **πᾶς . . . μή**, the well-known Hebraistic form, the negative attaching itself to the verb, = "*non-utterance*—let that be for every corrupt word". **λόγος** = *word*, in the sense of a *saying*, *speech* or *utterance.* **σαπρός**, lit. *rotten* or *worn out* and unfit for use, and then *worthless*, *bad* (*e.g.*, qualifying *trees*, *fruit*, *fish* as the opposite of **καλός**, Matt. vii. 17, xii. 33, xiii. 48; Luke vi. 43, etc.). Here it does not seem to mean *filthy*, but, as the following clause, **ἀγαθός, κ.τ.λ.**, suggests, *bad*, *profitless*, *of no good to any one.* Some, however, give it the more specific sense, = *foul*, as including *scurrilous* and *unbecoming* utterance (Abb.).—**ἀλλ' εἴ τις ἀγαθὸς πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν τῆς χρείας**: *but such as is good for edification of the need.* **ἀλλ' εἴ τις**, = *but such as, but whatever;* lit. = "but if there is any . . . let it proceed out of your mouth" (Mey.). **ἀγαθός** with **πρός** or **εἰς** is sufficiently frequent in classical Greek in the sense of *suitable*, *serviceable for* something (*e.g.*, Plato, *Rep.*, vii., p. 522 A). The phrase **οἰκοδομὴν τῆς χρείας** is somewhat difficult to construe. Its difficulty probably accounts for the reading **πίστεως** instead of **χρείας** in D[1]F, etc. It cannot be dealt with by inversion as it is put in the AV, "to the use of edifying"; nor as equivalent to "those who have need" (Rück.); nor as = "as there may be need" (Erasm., *qua sit opus*). Neither can it be a gen. of quality, as if = "seasonable edification". The **τῆς** must have its full value, especially after the anarthrous **οἰκοδομήν**; and the **χρείας** is best taken either as the *gen. obj.*, = "edification applied to the need" (Mey., Alf., Abb.), or the gen. of *remote reference* (Ell.; *cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 235), "edification in reference to the need," *i.e.*, to the *present* need. So the Vulg. (am.) gives *ad aedificationem opportunitatis.*—**ἵνα δῷ χάριν τοῖς ἀκούουσι**: *that it may give grace to the hearers.* So the RV. The AV also gives "minister grace unto the hearers". The other old English versions likewise render **χάριν**, *grace*, except Tynd., who makes it "that it may have favour," and Cov., who renders it "that it be gracious to hear". Not a few (Theod., Luth., Rück., etc.) make it = *give pleasure.* But **χάρις** usually means *favour* or *benefit*, and the phrase **διδόναι χάριν** expresses the idea of *doing a kindness* to one (Soph., *Ajax.*, 1333;

h=Rom. xiv. 15. i Ch. i. 13 reff. k=Phil. ii. 16; 2 Tim. i. 12. l Here only; see ch. i. 7 reff. m Acts viii. 23; Rom. iii. 14, from Ps. ix. 27; Heb. xii. 15 only. n=Acts xxiii. 9 only; see Matt. xii. 19. o=Col. iii. 8 al. p=(in epp.) Col. ii. 14 only; Matt. xiii. 12 and Gosp. passim; Acts xxii. 22.

τοῖς ἀκούουσιν. 30. καὶ μὴ [h]λυπεῖτε[1] τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον[2] τοῦ θεοῦ,[3] ἐν ᾧ [i] ἐσφραγίσθητε [k]εἰς [l]ἡμέραν [l]ἀπολυτρώσεως. 31. πᾶσα [m]πικρία καὶ θυμὸς καὶ ὀργὴ[4] καὶ [n]κραυγὴ καὶ [o]βλασφημία [p]ἀρ-

[1] λυπητε KL, Cyr., al., Bas., Thdrt. [2] το αγ. πν. DEFG, d, e, g, Goth.

[3] τ. θεου om. 2, 49, Æth., Chr., Epiph., Tert.

[4] οργ. κ. θυμ. DEFG 37, 46, 55, 73, 116, d, e, f, g, Vulg., Copt., Clem., Ambrst., etc.

Plato, *Laws*, iii., p. 702 c; Exod. iii. 21; Ps. lxxxiv. 11); and in the NT it has this sense with the specific notion of *gracious* kindness or service (2 Cor. i. 15, viii. 6; James iv. 6; 1 Pet. v. 5). So it is here. The **λόγος** is the *subj.*, and the clause gives the Christian object of every *speech* or *utterance*, *viz.*, to do good to the hearers, to *impart a blessing* to them (Ell.). For words with a different result *cf.* 2 Tim. ii. 14.

Ver. 30. **καὶ μὴ λυπεῖτε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τοῦ Θεοῦ**: *and grieve not the Holy Spirit of God.* This is not a general exhortation, but one bearing, as the **καί** indicates, particularly on the preceding injunction. The utterance of evil or worthless words is repugnant to the holiness of the Spirit, and is to be refrained from as calculated to grieve Him. The injunction is made the more solemn by the designation of the Spirit as "the *Holy* Spirit" and the Spirit "of God". The Spirit is here regarded as capable of feeling, and so as personal. In Isa. lxiii. 10 we have a similar idea, following the statement that Jehovah was *afflicted* in all His people's affliction. These terms, no doubt, are anthropopathic, as all terms which we can use of God are anthropomorphic or anthropopathic. But they have reality behind them, and that as regards God's *nature* and not merely His acts. Otherwise we should have an unknown God and One who might be *essentially* different from what we are under the mental necessity of thinking Him to be. What *love* is in us points *truly*, though tremulously, to what love is in God. But in us love, in proportion as it is true and sovereign, has both its *wrath-side* and its *grief-side;* and so must it be with God, however difficult for us to think it out.—**ἐν ᾧ ἐσφραγίσθητε**: *in whom ye were sealed.* **ἐν ᾧ**, not "by whom" (Tynd., Cranm., Gen., Bish.), or "whereby" (AV), but "*in* whom," the Holy Spirit being the *environment* of the seal, the *sphere* or *element* in which it takes effect. On the *sealing* see on i. 13 above.—**εἰς ἡμέραν ἀπολυτρώσεως**: *unto the day of redemption.* **εἰς** is most simply taken as = *with a view to.* **ἀπολύτρωσις**, as in i. 14, Luke xxi. 28, Romans viii. 23, is the redemption of the future, and here specifically that redemption in its completeness and finality. The gen. is the gen. of *temporal relation*, = the day on which redemption will take effect, or manifest itself; *cf.* **ἡμέρα ὀργῆς** (Rom. ii. 2); **κρίσις μεγάλης ἡμέρας** (Jude 6). The consideration, therefore, that it is in the Spirit they have their security and their assurance of reaching the day when their redemption shall be made perfect, is an additional reason for avoiding everything out of harmony with His holy being and action.

Ver. 31. **πᾶσα πικρία**: *let all bitterness.* The noun **πικρία** occurs thrice again in the NT, and with different shades of meaning (Acts viii. 23; Rom. iii. 14; Heb. xii. 15). Meyer makes it = *fretting spitefulness* here. But it seems to be more than that (*cf.* **χολὴ πικρίας** as a description of exceptional wickedness in Acts viii. 23), and to mean *resentfulness*, *harshness*, *virulence.* In James iii. 11 **τὸ πικρόν** is contrasted with **τὸ γλυκύ**, and in ver. 14 it qualifies **ζῆλον** which again is coupled with **ἐρίθειαν.** The **πᾶσα** has the force of "all manner of". Harshness in all its forms whether in speech or in feeling (the latter, perhaps, being specially in view as the contrasting **χρηστοί** suggests) is to be put away. —**καὶ θυμὸς καὶ ὀργή**: *and wrath and anger.* These two words are often conjoined in non-biblical Greek, in the LXX and in the NT (*e.g.*, Rom. ii. 8; Col. iii. 8; Rev. xvi. 19, xix. 15). So far as they differ, the distinction is that **θυμός** is *fury*, the more passionate and passing sentiment, the *burst* of anger, and **ὀργή** the settled disposition. So in Ecclus. xlviii. 10 we get the phrase **κοπάσαι ὀργὴν πρὸ θυμοῦ.** See Trench, *Syn.*, pp. 123-125.—**καὶ κραυγή**: *and clamour.*

θήτω ἀφ' ὑμῶν σὺν πάσῃ [q]κακίᾳ, 32. γίνεσθε δὲ [1] εἰς ἀλλήλους [r]χρηστοί, [s]εὔσπλαγχνοι, [t]χαριζόμενοι [u]ἑαυτοῖς καθὼς καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐν χριστῷ [2] ἐχαρίσατο ὑμῖν.[3]

q Rom. i. 29; Col. iii. 8. r=(in epp.) here only; Luke vi. 35; see ch. ii. 7 reff. s 1 Pet. iii. 8 only †. t Luke vii. 42, 43; 2 Cor. ii. 7, 10, xii. 13; Col. ii. 13. t u Col. iii. 13.

[1] Omit δε B 32, 47, 69, 177, lect. 14, Clem., Orig., Dam., Oec.; for δε, ουν DFG, lect. 6, 14, it.; τε Syr., Æth.; δε ℵAD[3]EKLP, most mss., Vulg., Copt., Sah., Syr., al., Chrys., Thdrt., Thl., Tert., Jer., al.

[2] For ο θ. εν Χρ., ο Χριστος 14, 48, 62, al., Antioch.$_1$, Tert.; ο θεος 11, 39, Thdrt., Dam.; ημιν BDEKL, al., 25, Syr., Chr.-comm., Thdrt., Thl.

[3] νμιν ℵAFGP, all d, e, f, Vulg., Copt., Sah., Goth., al., Clem., Cyr., Chr.-text, Thl.-marg., Oec., Tert., Ambrst.-al.

κραυγή is sometimes the cry of *distress* (Heb. v. 7; Rev. xxi. 4). Here it is the outcry of *passion* (Acts xxiii. 9). **καὶ βλασφημία**: *and evil speaking*. Here it is obviously slanderous or injurious speech with reference to *brethren* (Matt. xii. 31, xv. 19; Mark iii. 28, vii. 22; Col. iii. 8; 1 Tim. vi. 4). So **πικρία**, the harsh, virulent temper, works **θυμὸν καὶ ὀργήν**, wrath and anger, and these again induce **κραυγὴν καὶ βλασφημίαν**, passionate clamour and hurtful speech.—**ἀρθήτω ἀφ' ὑμῶν σὺν πάσῃ κακίᾳ**: *be put away from you together with all malice*. **κακία** may mean either *wickedness* generally (Acts viii. 22; 1 Cor. v. 8, xiv. 20; 1 Pet. ii. 16); or *ill-will, malignity* in particular (Rom. i. 29; Col. iii. 8; Tit. iii. 3; James i. 21; 1 Pet. ii. 1). The context points to the latter here. So Wicl., Cov., Rhem., AV, RV; while Tynd. gives "maliciousness," and the Bish. "naughtiness".

Ver. 32. **γίνεσθε δὲ εἰς ἀλλήλους χρηστοί**: *but become ye kind one to another*. The **δέ** is omitted by B, *k*, 177, Clem., etc., while **οὖν** is substituted for it in D[1]F, 114. It is bracketed by WH and by Tr marg., and is omitted by L. But it is quite in place, having its combined *connecting* and *opposing* force; *cf.* on ver. 15 above. **γίνεσθε** (not **ἐστέ**), = "become ye," or "show yourselves," rather than "be ye". The idea is that they had to abandon one mental condition and make their way, beginning there and then, into its opposite. **χρηστοί**, = *kind, benignant*, used of *God* (Luke vi. 35; Rom. ii. 4; 1 Pet. ii. 3), but here (its only occurrence in the Epistles) of *men*.—**εὔσπλαγχνοι**: *tender-hearted*. There could be no better rendering. In Col. iii. 12 the same disposition is expressed by **σπλάγχνα οἰκτιρμοῦ**. It is only in Scripture and in eccles. Greek that the adject. conveys the idea of *compassion* (*Pray. of Manass.*, 7; *Test. XII. Patr., Test. Zab.*, § 9).—**χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς**: *forgiving each other*. Partic. co-ordinate with the **χρηστοί, εὔσπλαγχνοι**, denoting one special form in which the kindness and tender-heartedness were to show themselves. **χαρίζομαι** means either to *give graciously* (Luke vii. 21; Rom. viii. 32; Phil. ii. 9, etc.), or to *forgive* (Luke vii. 42; 2 Cor. ii. 7, 10, xii. 13; Col. ii. 13, iii. 13). Some adopt the former sense here (Vulg., *donantes*; Eras., *largientes*). But the second is more in harmony with the context. For the use of **ἑαυτοῖς** as = **ἀλλήλοις** in classical Greek (*e.g.*, Soph., *Antig.*, 145) see Kühner, *Greek Gram.*, ii., p. 497; Jelf, *Greek Gram.*, § 54, 2. In the NT the same use prevails (1 Cor. vi. 7; Col. iii. 13, 16, etc.). The two forms are often conjoined in the same paragraph or sentence, both in classical Greek (Xen., *Mem.*, ii., 7, iii., 5, 16, etc.) and in the NT (as here, Col. iii. 13; 1 Pet. iv. 8, etc.). If there is any distinction between them, it is that the idea of *fellowship* or *corporate unity* is more prominent in **ἑαυτοῖς**; *cf.* Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, pp. 169, 170; Light. and Ell. on Col. iii. 13.—**καθὼς καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἐν Χριστῷ ἐχάρισατο ὑμῖν**: *even as also God in Christ forgave you*. **καθὼς** points to the Divine example; **καὶ** places the two instances, the Divine and the human, over against each other; the reference and the comparison indicate the supreme reason or motive for our fulfilment of the injunction. **ἐν Χριστῷ** is not "for Christ's sake" (AV) or *per Christum* (Calv.), but "*in* Christ" as in 2 Cor. v. 19; the God who forgives being the God who manifests Himself and acts *in* the suffering, reconciling Christ. The aor. should be rendered *did forgive* with Wicl., Tynd., Gen., Bish., RV (not "hath

a 1 Cor. iv. 16, xi. 1; 1 Thess. i. 6, ii. 14; Heb. vi. 12 only.
b 1 Cor. iv. 14, 17; 2 Tim. i. 2; see Phil. ii. 15.
c Ch. ii. 10 reff.
d Gal. ii. 20; ver. 25 only.
e = Acts xxi. 26, xxiv. 17; Rom. xv. 16; Heb. (5).
e f Heb. x. 5, from Ps. xxxix. 6.

V. 1. Γίνεσθε οὖν [a]μιμηταὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς [b]τέκνα [b]ἀγαπητά, 2. καὶ [c]περιπατεῖτε [c]ἐν ἀγάπῃ, καθὼς καὶ ὁ χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς[1] καὶ [d]παρέδωκεν [d]ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν[2] [e]προσφορὰν καὶ [f]θυσίαν[3]

[1] ημας ℵ[3]DEFGKL, d, e, f, g, Vulg., Syr., Cop., Arm., etc.; υμας ℵ*ABP 32, 37, 71, 73, 116, Sah., Eth., Clem., Euth., Dam., etc.
[2] υμων B 37, 73, 116, Sah., Eth., Dam., etc. [3] θυσιαν και προσφοραν ℵ.

forgiven" as in AV, etc.), the point being the forgiveness effected when Christ died. The reading **ὑμῖν**, supported by ℵAGP, 37, Sah., Boh., Vulg., Goth., Eth., etc. is to be preferred on the whole to **ἡμῖν** which appears in DKL, 17, 47, Syr., Arm., etc. L gives **ἡμῖν** in text; TrWHRV give it in margin.

CHAPTER V. Vv. 1-14. A paragraph ruled by the general idea of the imitation of God in the forgiving love which has been appealed to in the preceding verse. In the light of that Divine example Paul charges his readers to follow purity, unselfishness, sobriety and other graces, and to avoid all heathen vices and indulgences opposed to these.

Ver. 1. **γίνεσθε οὖν μιμηταὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ**: *become ye therefore imitators of God.* **γίνεσθε**, as in iv. 32, = "become ye," rather than "be ye". This **γίνεσθε** also resumes the former **γίνεσθε** (iv. 32), and continues the general injunction expressed by it. The **οὖν** points to the same connection of ideas, while it introduces new exhortations based on the supreme fact of God's forgiving love in Christ. Of the duties inculcated on that basis the first and the one most immediately in view is that of the forgiveness of those who wrong us—a forgiveness which should be free, loving, ungrudging, complete as God's forgiveness is. The term **μιμητής** is used of the imitation of *men* (1 Cor. iv. 16, xi. 1; 1 Thess. i. 6; Heb. vi. 12), *Churches* (1 Thess. ii. 14), *things* (1 Pet. iii. 13 with **ζηλωταί** as var. reading). Only here is it used of the imitation of *God*—the loftiest and most exalting endeavour that can possibly be set before man, proposed to us also by Christ Himself (Matt. v. 45, 48).—**ὡς τέκνα ἀγαπητά**: *as children beloved.* Not merely "dear children" (AV). The compar. part. **ὡς** points to the *manner* or *character* in which the *imitation* is to be made good, and indicates at the same time a *reason* for it (Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 270). They are children of God, experiencing His love. Children should be like the father, and love should meet love; *cf.* Matt. v. 45.

Ver. 2. **καὶ περιπατεῖτε ἐν ἀγάπῃ**: *and walk in love.* Here, again, **καί** *explains* in *connecting* and *adding*. The "imitation" must take effect in the practical, unmistakable form of a loving course of life.—**καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς**: *even as Christ also loved us* [*you*]. The reading **ὑμᾶς** (with B ℵ[1]A, Sah., Eth., etc.; TTrWHRV) is to be preferred to the **ἡμᾶς** of TR (with DKFL ℵ[3], etc.). The aor. should have its proper historical force, "loved," not "hath loved" (AV). *Christ* is now introduced as the great Example, instead of *God*, and the Divine love as openly seen in Christ is given as the *motive* and the *pattern* of the love that should mark our walk.—**καὶ παρέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν**: *and gave Himself up.* Statement of the act in which Christ's love received its last and highest expression, *viz.*, the surrender of Himself to death. The **καί** has something of its *ascensive* force. The idea of *death* as that to which He gave Himself up is implied in the great Pauline declarations, *e.g.*, Rom. iv. 25, viii. 32; Gal. ii. 20; Eph. v. 25.—**ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν**: *for us.* The **ἡμῶν** of the TR, supported by ℵADFKL, etc., is to be preferred on the whole to the **ὑμῶν** of B, m, 116, etc., which is regarded by WH as the primary reading and given in marg. by RV. The prep. **ὑπέρ** seldom goes beyond the idea of "on account of," "for the benefit of". In classical Greek, however, it does sometimes become much the same as **ἀντί** (*e.g.*, Eurip., *Alc.*, 700; Plato, *Gorg.*, 515 c), and in the NT we find a clear instance in Philem. 13. In some of the more definite statements, therefore, on Christ's death as a sacrifice (2 Cor. v. 14, 15, 21; Gal. iii. 13, and here) it is thought that the more general sense is sharpened by the context into that of "in place of". But even in these the idea of substitution, which is properly expressed by **ἀντί** (Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45), is not in the **ὑπέρ** itself, although it may

τῷ θεῷ [g] εἰς [h] ὀσμὴν [h] εὐωδίας. 3. [i] πορνεία [l] δὲ καὶ [k] ἀκαθαρσία [g] Ch. ii. 22 reff. πᾶσα [2] [l] ἢ [l] πλεονεξία μηδὲ [m] ὀνομαζέσθω ἐν ὑμῖν, καθὼς [n] πρέπει [h] Phil. iv. 18 only;

Gen. viii. 21; Lev. i. 9 and pass. v. 10; ver. 5. i k Col. iii. 5; Gal. v. 19; 2 Cor. xii. 21. l See 1 Cor. v. 10; ver. 5. m Ch. i. 21 reff. n Constr., 1 Tim. ii. 10; Tit. ii. 1; Heb. ii. 10, vii. 26 only.

[1] πορνεια BD³KL, etc.; πορνια ℵAD*FGP, etc.

[2] πασα *after* ακαθαρσια ℵAP 17, 31, 39, Copt., Orig., etc.; *before* ακαθαρσια DE FGKL, Bas., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., etc.

be in the context; *cf.* Win.-Moult., pp. 434, 435; Mey. on Rom. v. 6, Gal. iii. 13; Ell. on Gal. iii. 13.—**προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν τῷ Θεῷ**: *an offering and a sacrifice to God.* The primary idea in the whole statement is the love of Christ, and that love as shown in giving Himself up to death. This giving up of Himself to death is next defined in respect of its character and meaning, and this again with the immediate purpose of magnifying the love which is the main subject. The acc., therefore, is the *pred.* acc., = "as an offering". The defining **τῷ Θεῷ**, as its position indicates, is best connected with the **προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν**; not with **παρέδωκεν αὐτόν**, to which **εἰς θάνατον** is the natural supplement; nor with **εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας**, for that would place **τῷ Θεῷ** in an *emphatic* position not easy to account for. The term **προσφορά** is used in the NT of offerings of all kinds, whether bloody or unbloody, whether of the *meal offering*, מִנְחָה (Heb. x. 6; Ps. xl. 7), or of the bloody offering (Heb. x. 10) and the expiatory sacrifice (Heb. x. 18). When it has the latter sense, it has usually some defining term attached to it (**περὶ ἁμαρτίας** (Heb. x. 18), **τοῦ σώματος Ἰ. Χ.** (Heb. x. 10)). The term **θυσία** in like manner is used for different kinds of offerings. In the LXX it represents both מִנְחָה and זֶבַח, and in the NT in such passages as Matt. ix. 13, xii. 7, etc., it is used generally. Sometimes it is applied to unbloody oblations (Heb. xi. 4). Again (*e.g.*, Heb. ix. 23, x. 5, 26) it is sin-offerings, expiatory offerings that are in view. The two terms, therefore, cannot in themselves be sharply distinguished, but they get their distinctive sense in each case from the context. Here, as in Heb. v. 8, etc., it is possible that the two terms are used to cover the two great classes of offerings; in which case, as in Ps. xl. 6, 8, the **θυσίαν** will refer to the sacrifice of slain beasts. If that is so, the sin-offering, or oblation presented with a view to the restoration of broken fellowship will be in view. And this is in accordance with the particular NT doctrine of Christ's death as a *propitiation*, which has a distinct and unmistakable place in Paul's Epistles, though not in his only (Rom. iii. 23; 1 John ii. 2, iv. 10), and a *reconciliation* (Rom. v. 11; 2 Cor. v. 18, 19), as well as with the OT view of sacrifice offered in order to effect forgiveness and removal of guilt (Lev. iv. 20, 26, 35, v. 10, 13, 16, etc.).—**εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας**: *for a savour of sweet smell.* So Ell.; "for an odour of a sweet smell" (RV); "for a sweet smelling savour" (AV, Gen., Bish.); "in to the odour of sweetness" (Wicl.); "in an odour of sweetness" (Rhem.); "sacrifice of a sweet savour" (Tynd., Cov., Cranm.). Statement of the *acceptability* of Christ's sacrifice, taken from the OT רֵיחַ־נִיחוֹחַ, Lev. i. 9, 13, 17, ii. 12, iii. 5, etc. (*cf.* Gen. viii. 21; Phil. iv. 18), where **ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας** is defined as **θυσίαν δεκτήν, εὐάρεστον τῷ Θεῷ**. The foundation of the phrase is of course the ancient idea that the smoke of the offerings rose to the nostrils of the god, and that in this way the Deity became partaker of the oblation along with the worshipper (Hom., *Il.*, xxiv., 69, 70). The phrase was naturally used oftenest of the burnt offering (Lev. ii. 9, 13, 17), and some have argued that there is nothing more in view here than the idea of self-dedication contained in that offering. But the phrase is used also of the expiatory offering (Lev. iv. 31).

Ver. 3. **πορνεία δὲ καὶ πᾶσα ἀκαθαρσία**: *but fornication and all uncleanness.* The better order **ἀκαθαρσία πᾶσα** (LTTrWHRV) throws the emphasis on **πᾶσα**, = "fornication and uncleanness, every kind of it". The metabatic **δέ** carries the exhortation over to a prohibition expressed in the strongest terms, which is levelled against one of the deadliest and most inveterate temptations to which Gentile Christians were exposed. The term **πορνεία** is to be taken in its proper sense and is not to be restricted to any one particular form—the license prac-

o Ch. i. 1 reff. p q r Here only. s Col. iii. 18; Philem. 8 only; 1 Macc. xi. 35. and Paul only; exc. Rev. iv. 9, vii. 12. t = Acts xxiv. 3; Phil. iv. 6; Col. ii. 7 al.; Luke u Constr., here only; see Luke iv. 44 reff.; Gen. i. 6.

o ἁγίοις, 4. καὶ p αἰσχρότης [1] καὶ q μωρολογία ἢ r εὐτραπελία τὰ οὐκ s ἀνήκοντα,[2] ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον t εὐχαριστία. 5. τοῦτο u γὰρ ἴστε [3] γινώ-

[1] **και αισχροτης** ℵBD[3]KLP, Syr.-P., Copt., Arm., Clem., Bas., etc.; **η αισχροτης** AD*FG 23, 31, 39, Vulg., Sah., Euth., etc.

[2] **α ουκ ανηκεν** ℵABP 31, 67[2], 73 (17 omg. ἅ), Clem.$_1$, Eph., Antioch., Cyr., (latt.); **τα ουκ ανηκοντα** DEFG^{c}KL, most mss., Clem., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., al.

[3] **εστε γιν.** with D[3]EKL, etc., Syr., al., Thdrt., Dam., Thl.; **ητε** 73; **ιστε** ℵABD FG 23[1], 31-9, 44-7, 57, al., Vulg., Copt., Arm., Clem., Cyr., Chr., Oec., Suid., Cypr., Jer., Vig., Per., all.

tised at heathen festivals, concubinage, marriage within prohibited degrees, or the like. The moral life of the Graeco-Roman world had sunk so low that, while protests against the prevailing corruption were never entirely wanting, fornication had long come to be regarded as a matter of moral indifference, and was indulged in without shame or scruple not only by the mass, but by philosophers and men of distinction who in other respects led exemplary lives.—**ἢ πλεονεξία**: *or covetousness*. Here, as in iv. 19, **πλεονεξία** is named along with **ἀκαθαρσία**. In this passage, as in the former, most commentators take the two terms to designate two distinct forms of sin, *viz.*, the two vices to which the ancient heathen world was most enslaved, immorality and greed; while some understand **πλεονεξία** to be rather a further definition of **ἀκαθαρσία** and give it the sense of *insatiability, inordinate affection, sensual* greed. The noun is found ten times in the NT and the verb **πλεονεκτεῖν** five times. In some of these occurrences **πλεονεξία** can mean nothing else than *covetousness* (*e.g.*, Luke xii. 15; 2 Cor. ix. 5; 1 Thess. ii. 5). But the question is whether it has that sense in all the passages, or has taken on the acquired sense of *sensual* greed or overreaching in some of them. That is not very easy to decide. The association of the word **πλεονέκτης** with sins of the flesh (*e.g.*, in 1 Cor. v. 10, 11) is urged in favour of the latter application (*cf.* Trench, *Syn. of the N. T.*, p. 79). But it is argued with reason that the use of the disjunctive **ἢ** between **πόρνοις** and **πλεονέκταις** there and the connecting of **πλεονέκταις** with **ἅρπαξιν** by **καί** point to a distinction between the former two and an identity between the latter. So, too, in Col. iii. 5 the noun **πλεονεξίαν** is differentiated from the **πορνείαν**, etc., by **τήν**. On the other hand, the passages in Rom. i. 29 and 2 Pet. ii. 14 seem to suggest something more than *covetousness*, and it is also to be noticed that the original idea of these terms was that of having or taking an *advantage* over others. In 1 Thess. iv. 6 the verb **πλέονεκτεῖν** is used along with **ὑπερβαίνειν** in this sense, with reference to the sin of adultery. The present passage is probably the one, so far as Pauline use is concerned, that most favours the second sense, and it must be added that even the argument from the force of the disjunctive **ἤ** must not be made too much of. For in chap. v. 5 we find **πόρνος** and **ἀκάθαρτος** connected by **ἤ**.—**μηδὲ ὀνομαζέσθω ἐν ὑμῖν**: *let it not be even named among you*. Cranm., Gen., Bish. render it "be once named". The strong neg. **μηδέ** gives it this force —"Not to speak of doing such a thing, let it not be even so much as mentioned among you". The partial parallel in *Herod.*, i., 138, **ἅσσα δέ σφι ποιέειν οὐκ ἔξεστι, ταῦτα οὐδὲ λέγειν ἔξεστι**, is noticed here by most.—**καθὼς πρέπει ἁγίοις**: *as becometh saints*. The position of sainthood or separation to God, in which the Gospel places the Christian, is so far apart from the license of the world as to make it utterly incongruous even to speak of the inveterate sins of a corrupt heathenism.

Ver. 4. **καὶ αἰσχρότης**: *and filthiness*. This is taken by many (Eth., Theophyl., Oec., Rück., Harl., etc.) to refer to indecent *talk*, which, however, would be expressed by **αἰσχρολογία** (Col. iii. 8). The context shows it to refer to sins of the flesh, but there is nothing to limit it to sinful *speech*. It denotes shameless, immoral conduct in general.—**καὶ μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπελία**: *and foolish talking or* [*and*] *jesting*. The readings here are somewhat uncertain as regards the particles. The TR has the support of such authorities as ℵ*P, Syr.-Harcl., Arm. for **καί . . . ἤ**; AD*G, Vulg., Sah., etc., give **ἤ . . . ἤ**; B ℵ[1]D[3]K, Boh., Eth.,

σκοντες, ὅτι πᾶς [v]πόρνος ἢ [w]ἀκάθαρτος ἢ [x]πλεονέκτης, ὅ[1] ἐστιν [v] 1 Cor. v. 11 al.; [y]εἰδωλολάτρης, οὐκ ἔχει [z]κληρονομίαν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ[2] τοῦ [a]χριστοῦ Paul only, exc. Rev.

xxi. 8, xxii. 15. w In Gospels and Rev. only with πνεῦμα; legal, Acts x. 14, 28, xi. 8; 1 Cor. vii. 14; 2 Cor. vi. 17; = here only. x 1 Cor. v. 10, 11, vi. 10 only; Sir. xiv. 9. y 1 Cor. v. 10, 11, vi. 9, x. 7; Rev. xxi. 8, xxii. 15. z Ch. i. 14 reff. a 1 Tim. v. 21; Rev. xx. 6.

[1] For ὅ ὅς ADEKL, most mss., Copt., Syr., Clem., Chr., Thdrt., all; ο ℵB 17, 67, lect. 40, al., Cyr., Jer.$_2$, also with ιδωλολατρια FG, It., Vulg., Cyp., Jer., Ambrst., al. For ο εστ., η or και Syr., Ar.-erp., Eth.

[2] εις την βας. τ. θ. κ. Χρ. FG, Ambrst., al.

etc., have καί . . . καί. The first is accepted by TRV; the second by L; the third by WH. The choice is between the first and third, and the balance of evidence is on the whole, although not very decidedly, on the side of καί . . . καί. The noun μωρολογία is of very rare occurrence. In common Greek it is found only a very few times (Arist., *Hist. An.*, i., 11; Plut., *Mor.*, 504 A); in the NT only this once. Its sense, however, is sufficiently clear.—**καὶ εὐτραπελία**: *and jesting.* This is the solitary occurrence of the noun in the NT. It is found, however, in Aristotle (who defines it as πεπαιδευμένη ὕβρις, *Eth. Nic.*, iv., 14), Pindar (*Pyth.*, i., 178), etc. It appears to have meant originally *versatility*, *facetiousness*, and to have acquired the evil sense of *frivolity* or *scurrility*. Here it is taken by some (*e.g.*, Trench, Ell.) to be *distinguished* from μωρολογία and to denote, therefore, not the sin of the tongue merely, but the "evil 'urbanitas' (in manners or words) of the witty, godless man of the world" (Ell.). This depends so far on the acceptance of the disjunctive ἤ as the proper reading, but may be essentially correct. AV and other old English Versions give *jesting*, except Wicl., who has *harlotry*, and the Rhem. which gives *scurrility*.—**τὰ οὐκ ἀνήκοντα**: *things which are not seemly.* The article has the pred. force = "*as* things which are not seemly" (Mey.; *cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 610). The reading, however, varies. The TR is supported by the great mass of MSS—DGKL, etc.; but BℵAP, etc., give **ἃ οὐκ ἀνῆκεν**, which is to be preferred. The clause is in apposition to the preceding; but probably only to the latter two nouns, μωρολογία and εὐτραπελία, as these form the direct contrast to the following **εὐχαριστία**. *Cf.* τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα of Rom. i. 28.—**ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εὐχαριστία**: *but rather giving of thanks.* The brachylogy (*cf.* Jelf, *Greek Gram.*, § 705, 3) requires ἔστω or rather **γίνεσθω** to be supplied. The **εὐχαριστία** is understood by some to mean *gracious speech* (Clem. Al.; also Jer., with a *perhaps*), or *pious*, *edifying* discourse generally (Calv., on the analogy of Col. iv. 6; Prov. xi. 6). Others give it the sense of *courteous* speech (Mor.). But the idea of gracious speech would be expressed rather by **εὔχαρι**, and, as Meyer points out, the contrast which would thus result would be less in keeping with "the Christian character and the profoundly vivid piety of the Apostle". On nothing does he more insist than on the grace of thankfulness, and the expression of it, to God for the gifts of His love to sinful men.

Ver. 5. **τοῦτο γὰρ ἴστε γινώσκοντες**: *for this ye know, being aware that.* The TR reads **ἔστε** = *ye are* (with D^3KL, Theod., Theophyl., etc.), taking it with the participle as = "ye are aware". But **ἴστε** (which is supported by BℵAD*GP, Vulg., Goth., Sah., Boh., Arm., Chrys., etc.) must be preferred. The phrase **ἴστε γινώσκοντες** is explained by some as a Hebr. form, following the well-known use of the inf. with the fin. verb, or as having the force of the participle with the fin. verb in such expressions as **γινώσκων γνώσῃ** (Gen. xv. 13); and so the RV renders it—"ye know of a surety". But in such formulæ the *same* verb occurs in both cases, whereas here we have two distinct verbs. Hence it is best rendered—"ye know, being aware that". It is an appeal to their consciousness of the incompatibility of such sins with the inheritance of the Kingdom of God. It is not necessary, therefore (with von Hofmann), to put a full stop between the **ἴστε** and the **γινώσκοντες**, and make **ἴστε** refer to the *preceding* statement. Nor is there any reason for taking **ἴστε** as an imper. (so Vulg., Beng., etc.) instead of an indic. The **τοῦτο** refers to what *follows*, and the **γάρ** introduces a reason for the former injunctions. These injunctions are enforced by a reference to the reader's own knowledge, and that reference to their knowledge is made in direct appeal to

b 1 Tim. ii. καὶ [a]θεοῦ.[1] 6. μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς [b]ἀπατάτω [c]κενοῖς λόγοις· διὰ ταῦτα
14; James i. 26 only. γὰρ ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς [d]υἱοὺς τῆς [d]ἀπειθείας.
c 1 Cor. xv. 10, 14, 58 al.; Col. ii. 8; James ii. 20; Exod. v. 9; Job. vi. 6. d Ch. ii. 2 reff.

[1] Χριστου 14, al.; θ. κ. Χ. Ar.-erp., Ambrst., al.; Χ. του θεου Eth., Ar.-pol., Thdrt.$_1$.

their consciousness.—**ὅτι πᾶς πόρνος ἢ ἀκάθαρτος**: *that no fornicator or unclean person.* On the Hebr. formula **πᾶς . . . οὐκ**, "every one . . . shall not," see on iv. 29 above and Win.-Moult., p. 209.—**ἢ πλεονέκτης**: *or covetous man.* The **πλεονέκτης** appears here again to have its proper sense, and not any secondary application.—**ὅς ἐστιν εἰδωλολάτρης**: *who is an idolater.* This reading of the TR has the support of ADKLP, Syr.-Harcl., Boh., Arm., Chrys., etc. But there are two interesting variants, *viz.*, **ὃ ἐστιν εἰδωλολατρεία,** which is the reading of G, Vulg., Goth., Syr.-Pes. (probably), and **ὅ ἐστιν εἰδωλολάτρης,** which is given by B א, 67^2, Jer., etc. The choice must be between this last and the TR. On the whole the former is to be preferred (with LTTrWHRV) on textual grounds, and that reading will then have the force of "which is the same as an idolater". Some (Harl., etc.) refer the relative (**ὅς**) to all three previous nouns; but the analogy of Col. iii. 5 is against that. It is true that *fornication* and *uncleanness* might also well be called forms of idolatry. But the point here seems to be that the *covetous, grasping* man in particular, who makes a god of Mammon, is much the same as the worshipper of an idol; and the **πλεονέκτης** is thus made synonymous with the **εἰδωλολάτρης** in order to stigmatise avarice as a specifically anti-Christian vice, essentially incompatible with the spirit of self-sacrifice which is of the very being of Christianity and was inculcated so strenuously by Paul himself.—**οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομίαν**: *has inheritance.* The **ἔχει** is taken by Meyer as a case of *present* for *future*, marking a looked-for event as just as certain as if it were already with us. But it is rather a proper present, appropriate here as the expression of a principle or law; *cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 331.—**ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ**: *in the Kingdom of Christ and God.* The clause has been understood as an affirmation of Christ's Godhead, as if = "the Kingdom of Him who is at once Christ and God" (Beza, Beng., Rück., Harl.); and some, with this view of its import, have held it to be an example of the application of Sharp's rule. But that rule is inapplicable here by reason of the fact that **Θεός** is independent of the article and occurs indeed without it in the phrase **βασιλεία Θεοῦ** (1 Cor. vi. 9, 10, xv. 50; Gal. v. 21). **Θεοῦ** has the same *climactic* force here as in 1 Cor. iii. 22, etc. The kingdom is *Christ's*, committed to Him now, but to be delivered up at last to God, who is to be sole and absolute Sovereign (1 Cor. xv. 24, 28).

Ver. 6. **μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς ἀπατάτω κενοῖς λόγοις**: *let no one deceive you with vain words.* A solemn warning, made the more pointed by being given without any connecting particle. **κενός** is "vain" in the sense of *empty*, without the substance of truth or reality, and so = *sophistical; cf.* **κενολογεῖν** in Isa. viii. 19. But what is the reference? Some think *heathen philosophers* and *Jews* are in view (Grot.), or *Judaisers* in particular (Neand.), or *antinomian Christians* (Olsh.), or *teachers of Gentile tendencies* (Meyer), or *false brethren in the Churches* (Abb.). But the expression is a general one, applying to all who sought by their sophistries to palliate the vices in question or make them appear to be no vices. These would be found mostly (though by no manner of necessity exclusively) among the heathen, especially among such Gentiles as heard the truth and remained unbelieving. This is most accordant with the descriptive terms which follow, *viz.*—**υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας; μὴ . . . συμμέτοχοι αὐτῶν; ἦτε γάρ ποτε σκότος.** (So Mey., Ell., etc.)—**διὰ ταῦτα γὰρ ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ**: *for because of these things cometh the wrath of God.* The **διὰ ταῦτα,** which is placed emphatically first, refers of course to the *sins* in question; not to the "vain words," as Chrys., *e.g.*, strangely thought. The certainty of the Divine retribution is added as an enforcement of the previous warnings. It is given in terms of a solemn present (**ἔρχεται**) and in the form of "the wrath of God"—an expression which occupies a very large place both in the OT and in the NT. This **ὀργὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ** is not to be limited (with Ritschl.) to the judgment of the last day, or taken as synonymous with the *vindicta Dei*, or resolved into a figure

7. μὴ οὖν γίνεσθε [c]συμμέτοχοι αὐτῶν. 8. [f]ἦτε γάρ ποτε [g]σκότος, e Ch. iii. 6 reff.
νῦν δὲ [g]φῶς ἐν κυρίῳ· ὡς [h]τέκνα φωτὸς περιπατεῖτε 9. (ὁ γὰρ f Rom. vi. 17.

g Acts xxvi. 18; Rom. ii. 29, xiii. 12; 2 Cor. iv. 6 al. h Ch. ii. 3 reff.

of speech with no reality behind it, or identified simply with certain *effects*—the workings of conscience, the shortness and the ills of life, the penalties of the present existence, etc. It is given in Scripture, just as the love, the righteousness, the holiness of God are given, as an *affectus* and not merely an *effectus*, a quality of the perfect moral nature of God, an attitude and sensibility of the Divine Mind toward evil. It is exhibited as operating now, but also as looking to fulfil itself completely in the final adjustment. Here its future operation in the ultimate awards may be specially in view, but not that alone. Meyer puts it too narrowly when he says it is "the wrath of God *in the day of judgment*, which future, as in ver. 5, is realised as present". —**ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας**: *upon the sons of disobedience.* For **ἀπειθείας** WH prefer **ἀπειθίας.** The phrase has been used already in ii. 2, and there with reference to the unregenerate. Here, again, it describes the persons in respect of their "essential and innate disobedience" (Ell.). The **ἀπειθεία** in view is the denial of faith, disobedience to the truth of the Gospel of God, and so to God Himself; see on ii. 2, and *cf.* Rom. xi. 30, 32, xv. 31; Heb. iv. 6, 11.

Ver. 7. **μὴ οὖν γίνεσθε συμμέτοχοι αὐτῶν**: *become not ye then partakers with them.* **γίνεσθε** again = "do not become," "suffer not yourselves to be"; not **ἐστε**, "be not". What is meant is a possible falling back into ways by grace forsaken. The *participation* which is negatived is obviously taking part with the sons of disobedience (**αὐτῶν**) in their *vices*, not merely in their punishment or in the **ὀργή.** The term **συμμέτοχος** (or **συνμέτοχος**, TWH) occurs only here and in iii. 6 above. The **οὖν** has the force which it has in v. 1, giving the inference to be drawn from the statement of the *wrath of God.*

Ver. 8. **ἦτε γάρ ποτε σκότος**: *for ye were once darkness.* A consideration in support of the previous exhortation, *viz.*, the consideration that with them the condition in which such sins could be indulged was wholly past and gone. The **ἦτε** is put emphatically first to throw stress on the fact that all *that* is now *behind* them, and surely not a condition to which they could revert. No **μέν** requires to be supplied here. Its omission in this clause, while the next has **δέ**, is nothing strange or irregular, the **μέν** being inserted only "when the first clause is intended to stand in connection with and prepare the reader for the opposition to the second" (Ell.). See Ell. on Gal. ii. 15; Jelf, *Greek Gram.*, p. 765; Donaldson, *Greek Gram.*, pp. 575-578. It has to be remembered also that the correlation of those two particles has by no means the position in NT Greek which it has in classical Greek. In point of fact it has little or no place in the Catholic Epistles except 1 Pet. (to some extent), or in 2 Thess., 1 Tim., Tit., Philem., and the Apoc., and is comparatively rare even in the Gospels; *cf.* Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, pp. 266, 267. The abstract **σκότος**, instead of **ἐσκοτισμένοι** or similar concrete form, adds greatly to the force of the representation. They were darkness itself,—persons "in whom darkness becomes visible and holds sway" (Thay.-Grimm), so utterly sunk in ignorance of Divine things, so wholly lost in the evils accompanying such ignorance —**νῦν δὲ φῶς ἐν Κυρίῳ**: *but now ye are light in the Lord.* Instead of what they once were they had become enlightened by the Gospel, discerners of Divine truth and subjects of the new life which it opens to men. The completeness of the change is indicated again by the use of the abstract term—so possessed and penetrated were they by that truth that they could be described not simply as *enlightened* but as themselves now *light.* And this "in the Lord," for it was in virtue of their fellowship with Christ that this new apprehension of things came to them, transforming their lives. —**ὡς τέκνα φωτὸς περιπατεῖτε**: *walk as children of light.* The strong abstracts **σκότος, φῶς,** come in fitly before the exhortation and make it more pointed. The omission of **οὖν** or any similar particle adds further to the force of the exhortation. If these Ephesians were now "light in the Lord," it was not for themselves only but for others. They were called to live a life beseeming those to whom Christian enlightenment and purity had become their proper nature; *cf.* Luke xvi. 8; John xii. 36; 1 Thess. v. 5. Nothing is to be made of the absence of the article here in contrast

i Rom. xv. 14; Gal. v. 22; 2 Thess. i. 11 only; Neh. ix. 35. k Constr., Rom. xii. 2; see Luke xiv. 19 reff. l Rom. xii. 1; Phil. iv. 18; Col. iii. 20 al. Paul (and Heb.) only.

i καρπὸς τοῦ φωτὸς[1] ἐν πάσῃ [i]ἀγαθωσύνῃ[2] καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ), 10. [k]δοκιμάζοντες τί ἐστιν [l]εὐάρεστον τῷ κυρίῳ[3]· 11. καὶ

[1] πνευματος D^3E^2KL, etc., Syr., al., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., al.; φωτος ℵABDEFGP 6, 10, 17, 47, 67^2, 179, 213, al., It., Vulg., Syr., Ar.-erp., Copt., Sah., Eth., Arm., Marcion., Lat. Fathers.

[2] αγαθοσυνη DEFGLP 37, al.

[3] For κυρ., θεω DFG, it., v., Lat. Fathers (exc. Aug.).

with τοῦ φωτὸς of ver. 2, the general practice being to insert or omit the article in the case of the governed noun according as the governing noun has it or wants it (Rose's Middleton, *On the Greek Article*, iii., 3, 7, p. 49).

Ver. 9. ὁ γὰρ καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος [φωτός]: *for the fruit of the Spirit* [*the light*]. The reading of the TR, τοῦ πνεύματος, which is that of such uncials as D^3KL, most cursives, Syr.-P., Chrys., etc., must give place to τοῦ φωτός, which is supported by BℵAD*GP, 67^2, Vulg., Goth., Boh., Arm., Orig., etc. The πνεύματος is probably a correction from Gal. v. 22. The whole verse is in effect a parenthesis, and is printed as such by the RV. But it is a parenthesis with a purpose, the γάρ being at once explanatory and confirmatory. It gives a reason for the previous injunction and an enforcement of it; the point being this—"Walk as I charge you; for anything else would be out of keeping with what is proper to the light and is produced by it". καρπός, *fruit*, a figurative term for the moral results of the light, its products as a whole; *cf.* Matt. iii. 8; Phil. i. 11, etc. In the corresponding statement in Gal. v. 22, where the καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος is contrasted with τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός, the singular term may also suggest the idea of the unity of the life and character resulting from the Spirit.—ἐν πάσῃ ἀγαθωσύνῃ: *is in all goodness*. ἐστι, *is, consists*, is left unexpressed after καρπός. The πάσῃ here again has the force of "every form of,"—in goodness in all its forms. The noun ἀγαθωσύνη appears again in Rom. xv. 14; Gal. v. 22; 2 Thess. i. 11. Thus it occurs only four times in the Pauline writings. It is used in the LXX, but appears not to belong to classical Greek. It varies somewhat in sense. In the OT it means sometimes *good* as opposed to evil (Ps. xxxviii. 20, lii. 3), sometimes *enjoyment* (Eccles. iv. 8), sometimes *benevolence*, the bountiful goodness of God (Neh. ix. 25). Here and in the other Pauline passages it is taken by some in the sense of *uprightness*, but appears rather to mean *active* goodness, *beneficence*; *cf.* Trench, *Syn.*, p. 218.—καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ: *and righteousness*. δικαιοσύνη here has the sense of *rectitude*, *probity*, freedom from the morally wrong or imperfect, as in Matt. iii. 15, v. 6, 10, 20, etc., and as also in such Pauline passages as Rom. vi. 13, 16, 18-20, viii. 10; 2 Cor. vi. 7, 14, etc.—καὶ ἀληθείᾳ: *and truth*. ἀλήθεια here in the subjective sense of *moral* truth, sincerity and integrity as opposed to *falsehood*, *hypocrisy* and the like; *cf.* John iii. 21; 1 Cor. v. 8; Phil. i. 18, etc. Here, then, Christian morality is given in its three great forms of the *good*, the *just*, the *true*. Abbott compares the "justice, mercy, and truth" of the Gospels and Butler's "justice, truth, and regard to the common good".

Ver. 10. δοκιμάζοντες τί ἐστιν εὐάρεστον τῷ Κυρίῳ: *proving what is well-pleasing to the Lord*. The exhortation given in ver. 8, interrupted by the enforcement introduced in ver. 9, is now continued and explained. The participial sentence defines the *walk* which was enjoined in respect of the way in which it is to be made good. It is a *walk* which is to be taken up and carried out in the light of a constant trial of what pleases the Lord. The verb δοκιμάζειν here has its primary sense of *proving*, *testing* (*cf.* Rom. xii. 2), rather than its secondary sense of *approving* (*cf.* Rom. xiv. 22; 1 Cor. xvi. 3, etc.). Here, therefore, the δοκιμάζοντες expresses the idea of the careful trial, "the activity and experimental energy" (Ell.), necessary to the walk. The answer of the conscience (Rom. xiv. 23), or conformity to the Gospel (Rom. i. 16; Phil. i. 27), is given elsewhere as the test of the Christian walk. Here its correspondence with what is pleasing to God is given as its final proof and its most distinctive characteristic. εὐάρεστον is better rendered on

μὴ [m] συγκοινωνεῖτε τοῖς [n] ἔργοις τοῖς [o] ἀκάρποις [1] τοῦ [n] σκότους, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ [p] ἐλέγχετε. 12. τὰ γὰρ [q] κρυφῇ γινόμενα ὑπ' αὐτῶν

m Phil. iv. 14; Rev. xviii. 4 only.

n Rom. xiii. 12 only; see 1 Cor. iv. 5; Isa. xxix. 15. o Matt. xiii. 22 Mark; Tit. iii. 14; 2 Pet. i. 8; Jude 12; see 1 Cor. xiv. 14; Wisd. xv. 4. p = John iii. 20; 1 Cor. xiv. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 2; Tit. i. 9, 13, ii. 15; Xen., *Symp.*, viii., 43. q Here only; Gen. xxxi. 26 al.

[1] For ακαρπ., ακαθαρτοις 61-2; ατακτοις 30[1], Slav.-ms.

the whole "well-pleasing" (RV), especially when Col. i. 10 is compared, than "acceptable" (AV).

Ver. 11. **καὶ μὴ συγκοινωνεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς ἀκάρποις τοῦ σκότους**: *and have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness.* TWH again prefer the form **συνκοινωνεῖτε.** The verb has its usual force here, and takes us back to the **συμμέτοχοι αὐτῶν** of ver. 7. The only question is whether it governs the **ἔργοις** itself, or an **αὐτοῖς** or **αὐτῶν** understood. Looking to the **συμμέτοχοι αὐτῶν** above, the **συγκοινωνήσαντές μου τῇ θλίψει** of Phil. iv. 14, etc., some prefer the latter, = "have no fellowship with them in the works". But the *gen.* probably would then be the proper case for the *things* in which the participation took place; *cf.* the use of **συγκοινωνεῖν** with **τινί τινος** (*Dio Cass.*, xxxvii., 41, etc.), and **συγκοινωνὸς τῆς ῥίζης,** etc. (Rom. xi. 17). Here, therefore, as in the case of the **ἁμαρτίαις** in Rev. xviii. 4 and even the **θλίψει** in Phil. iv. 14, the verb is best understood as governing the **ἔργοις** directly. Elsewhere we read of **ἔργα πονηρά** (Col. i. 21), and **νεκρὰ ἔργα** (Heb. vi. 1); here of **ἔργα ἄκαρπα,** works which result in no gain, yield nothing pleasant or profitable, bring no blessing or reward with them; *cf.* the contrast between the *works* of the flesh and the *fruit* of the Spirit in Gal. v. 19, 22.—**μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐλέγχετε**: *but rather even reprove them.* This rendering of the RV is on the whole the best. AV omits the *even.* The other old English Versions render similarly, except Wicl., who has "but more"; Gen., 2, which gives "but even reprove them rather"; and Bish., "but even rebuke". The formula **μᾶλλον δὲ καί,** combines the ideas of the corrective (**μᾶλλον**), the adversative (**δέ**) and the ascensive (**καί**), and means, therefore, "but rather even," not merely "yea, much more". Without the **καί** the phrase **μᾶλλον δέ** has the force of a corrective climax; *cf.* Mey. on Rom. viii. 34, Gal. iv. 9, and Fritz. on Rom. viii. 34. It was not enough, therefore, for them simply to *abstain* from such works; they must even *reprove* them. The question, however, is what is the proper sense of **ἐλέγχετε** here, and what is the force of the whole sentence? Some give the verb the sense of *reproving*, but understand the *reproof* in view to be both in *word* and in *deed* (Olsh.), or only in *deed, i.e.*, the reproof conveyed by the spectacle of a pure life and consistently moral walk. Others, looking to the following **τὰ γὰρ κρυφῇ γινόμενα,** etc., and thinking it incongruous to speak of an *oral* rebuke in connection with a statement of the shame it is even to *speak* of the sins in question, would give the verb the sense of *exposing* (Abb.). But both the context and the general idea connected with **ἐλέγχειν** in the Pauline writings (*cf.*, *e.g.*, 1 Cor. xiv. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 2; Tit. i. 9, 13, ii. 15) point to the notion of *oral* reproof. The idea, therefore, is that these Christians were not at liberty to deal lightly with such sins, or connive at them, or be silent about them, but had to speak out against them and hold them up to rebuke, with the view of bringing their heathen neighbours to apprehend their turpitude and forsake them.

Ver. 12. **τὰ γὰρ κρυφῇ γινόμενα ὑπ' αὐτῶν αἰσχρόν ἐστι καὶ λέγειν**: *for the things which are done by them in secret it is a shame even to speak of.* This rendering of the RV, which follows Ellicott's, does more justice to the *order* of the Greek than that of the AV. The term **κρυφῇ** occurs only this once in the NT; but it is found occasionally in the LXX. Lach., WH, Mey., etc., prefer the form **κρυφῇ**; most editors and grammarians (Treg., Tisch., Alf., Jelf, Win., etc.) adopt **κρυφῆ**; *cf.* Win.-Moult., pp. 52, 53. The **γάρ** introduces a reason for, or a confirmation of, the charge to *reprove* the sins. But what of the special point and connection? Some (*e.g.*, Harl.) would refer the **γάρ** to the **μὴ συγκοινωνεῖτε,** as if = "do not take part in their sins, for they are too vile even to mention". But this does not do justice to the difference between the **κρυφῇ γινόμενα** and the **ἔργα τοῦ σκότους.** Others, putting more into the **λέγειν** than it can properly bear, understand it as = "rebuke these sins openly, for to speak of them in any other

r Mark iv. 22; John iii. 21; Rom. i. 19 al. Paul.

αἰσχρόν ἐστιν καὶ λέγειν· 13. τὰ δὲ πάντα [p]ἐλεγχόμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτὸς [r]φανεροῦται· πᾶν γὰρ τὸ φανερούμενον φῶς ἐστιν.

terms than that of rebuke is shameful". Bengel finds in it a reason for the sins being only referred to and not specified by name. Stier, supposing the reproof *de facto* to be in view, makes it = "do not even name these sins, for if you did so you would yourselves be sinning, whereas your walk in the light will be their reproof". Others (Von Sod., Abb.), adopting the sense of "expose" for **ἐλέγχειν**, take the idea to be—"do not participate in these works, but expose them, for the things they do secretly it is a shame even to mention; but all these things when exposed by the light are made manifest in their true character". But the course of thought is simpler. The *secrecy* of the works in question is the reason why they require to be openly reproved; and the point is this—the heathen practise in secret vices too abominable even to mention; all the more is the need of open rebuke instead of silent overlooking or connivance (Mey., Ell., etc.). It is not *all* heathen sins, therefore, that are in view; for it would be an exaggeration to say that *all* such vices were of a kind too shameful even to speak of; but a certain class of sins, that worst class which are done in secret. This is in harmony with the emphatic position of the **κρυφῇ** and with the contrast in the **φανεροῦται**. But if the expression **κρυφῇ γινόμενα** covers less than the **ἔργα τοῦ σκότους**, there is nothing on the other hand to indicate that it refers specifically to the immoral licence of the Pagan *mysteries*, or any other single instance of dark and infamous excess. It includes all those shameless heathen indulgences which sought the cover of secrecy.

Ver. 13. **τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐλεγχόμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτὸς φανεροῦται, πᾶν γὰρ τὸ φανερούμενον φῶς ἐστί**: *but all, when they are reproved, are made manifest by the light: for everything that is made manifest is light.* Both the connection and the import of some of the words here are difficult to determine, and various interpretations have been proposed. The RV renders it "but all things when they are reproved are made manifest," treating it as a general statement. But the point and the harmony of the whole verse are best seen if the phrase **τὰ πάντα** is taken to refer to the secret practices which have been immediately in view, = "all of them," "all *these* things". The **ἐλεγχόμενα**, again, must have its proper sense of *reproved* or *rebuked*, and cannot be dealt with as synonymous with **πεφανεροῦται**. The anarthrous participle will express the *manner* or the *time* of the action in question, and is not = "all things *which* are reproved" (Vulg., AV, etc.), but is = "all *these* things when they are reproved". The **πᾶν** must be accepted as a neuter, there being no reason for taking it (with Bengel) as abstract for concrete and so = "every *man*". Further, the **φανερούμενον** and the **φανεροῦται** are naturally to be taken as of the same Voice. That the former cannot have the force of the Middle, "that which makes manifest," appears from the fact that there does not appear to be any instance of **φανεροῦσθαι** being anything else than a pure passive in the NT, although it occurs some fifty times there. Two particular difficulties remain, *viz.*, (*a*) the connection of **ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτός**, and (*b*) the sense of **φῶς** in the two clauses. As to (*a*), some attach the words to the **ἐλεγχόμενα**, = "when they are reproved by the light" (Syr., Copt., etc.). But, as the **ἐλέγχετε** (ver. 11) was introduced without any specification of the agent, it is most natural to connect the **ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτός** here not with the participle but with the fin. verb, and the best sense is got thereby. As to (*b*), it is held by some (*e.g.*, Ell.) that the term **φῶς** must have the same sense in both clauses, whether the primary sense or the metaphorical. But it is difficult to get a clear and consistent sense for the statement on that supposition, neither is it *necessary* that the **τοῦ φωτός** in the first clause should have identically the same sense as **φῶς** in the second. In point of fact in the former the idea of the *Christian* light, the light of the Christian truth previously referred to, seems to be in view; while in the latter clause, which gives a *general* statement in support of the preceding *particular* affirmation, **φῶς** has its primary sense. It should be added that, if **φανερούμενον** is part of the statement of a general truth, the objection taken by some (*e.g.*, Abb.) to the interpretation that deals with it as a true passive, *viz.*, that it should then be **πεφανερωμένον**, falls to the ground. These considerations, therefore, negative all such inter-

14. διὸ [s]λέγει [t]Ἔγειρε[1] ὁ [u]καθεύδων καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, [v]καὶ [w]ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστός.[2] 15. [x]βλέπετε οὖν [y]πῶς [s]ἀκριβῶς [t] Isa. xxvi. 19; (Heb.) ix. 1.

s Ch. iv. 8 reff.

u 1 Thess. v. 6 reff. v=James iv. 7; Rev. ii. 10. w Here only; Job xxv. 5. x=Matt. xxiv. 4 al.; 1 Cor. iii. 10, viii. 9, x. 22, xvi. 10; Gal. v. 15; Col. ii. 8; Heb. iii. 12, xii. 25. y See note. z=here only; see Acts xxvi. 5.

[1] εγειραι with some mss.; εγειρε MSS., al.

[2] επιψαυσεις του Χριστου D^1 and mss. in Chr.-Jer., d, e, f, Thdrt. (who however cites text from ἕνια τῶν ἀντιγρ. with approval), Orig., Ambrst.; επιφαυσει σοι ο Χριστος Marc., Clem., Orig.$_2$, Ath., Chr., Dam., Archel. (om. σοι), Jer., Ambr., Aug., Vig., Pel., al.

pretations as these—(1) "he who does not refuse to be made manifest, becomes an enlightened one" (Beng.); (2) "for all that is enlightened by the light, is itself light" (Olsh.); (3) "all things which are tested by the light of the doctrine of Christ, one has no need to keep secret; all, however, which one can perform openly is itself light"; (4) all those constructions which give φανερούμενον the Middle sense, *e.g.*, *omne enim illud, quod manifesta facit alia, lux est* (Erasm.); *lux enim illud est quod omnia facit manifesta* (Beza; similarly Calv., Bleek, etc.); (5) and all that make the *light* the agent of the ἐλέγχειν (De Wette, etc.). The sense, therefore, is this—"all these shameful things which are done by them in secret, when they are subjected to the open rebuke which Christians ought to give them, are laid bare by the light of the Christian truth acting in their reproof, so that the doers of them are made to see them in the odiousness of their real nature; for everything that is disclosed in its real colours ceases to be secret and becomes of the nature of light". So substantially Mey., Ell., etc. The δέ also has its proper, adversative force, as if = "these things indeed are done in secret; *but* (or *yet*) they are made manifest and displayed in their true character, when you reprove them in the power of Christian truth". Thus, the whole sentence becomes a further reason, derived from the *effects* of the act, for practising the ἐλέγχειν; and the second clause confirms the particular power ascribed to the Christian φῶς by reference to the general statement of the connection between *manifestation* and *light*.

Ver. 14. διὸ λέγει, Ἔγειραι ὁ καθεύδων καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστός: *Wherefore he saith, Awake thou that sleepest and arise from the dead, and Christ shall shine upon thee.* So the RV, better on the whole than the "shall give thee light" of the AV. The verse contains a quotation, but the great difficulty is in ascertaining its source and understanding its precise point. It is introduced by the subordinating, coordinating, and causal particle διό (on which see under ii. 11, and *cf.* Buttm., *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 233; Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 274) = δι' ὅ, "on which account," *i.e.*, "things being as I have stated them we have the Divine word, 'Arise,'" etc. The λέγει is taken by some (Haupt, Abb.) as = *it is said;* but in Paul's general use it is personal, ὁ Θεός or similar subject being understood; while φησὶ is the formula that may be used impersonally. (See on iv. 8, and *cf.* Bernh., *Synt.*, xii., 4, p. 419.) For ἔγειραι of the TR, which is the reading of the cursives, ἔγειρε, which is supported by B$\aleph$ADGKL and practically all uncials, must be accepted. It requires no σεαυτόν to be supplied; neither is it to be explained as an Active with a Middle sense; but is best understood as a formula like ἄγε, with the force of *up!* The imper. ἀνάστα for ἀνάστηθι occurs again in Acts xii. 7, as also in Theocr., 24, 36; Menander (Mein.), p. 48, etc.; *cf.* ἀνάβα (Rev. iv. 1), κατάβα (Mark xv. 30; but with a *v. l.*). The verb ἐπιφαύσει means properly to *dawn*, corresponding to the ordinary Greek ἐπιφώσκω, which is used also in the narratives of the Resurrection in Matt. xxviii. 1; Luke xxiii. 54. This is the only occurrence in the NT of the form ἐπιφαύσκω, which is found occasionally, however, in the LXX (Job xxv. 5, xxxi. 6, xli. 10, etc.). The noun ὑπόφαυσις also occurs in Herod., vii., 30. Instead of ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστός D* and certain manuscripts mentioned by Chrys., Theod., Jer., etc., read ἐπιψαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστός or ἐπιψαύσεις τοῦ Χριστοῦ. This reading was connected with the legend that our Lord's Cross was planted above Adam's burial-place, and that our first father was to be raised from the dead by the touch of the Saviour's body and blood. The clause as we have it means not merely "Christ will cause His face to shine graciously upon thee," but

"Christ will shine upon thee with the light of His truth and bring thee out of the pagan darkness of ignorance and immorality".

So much for the terms. But whence does the passage come? The answer which first suggests itself, and which is given by many (Calv., Est., Beng., Harl., Olsh., Hofm., Weiss, Alf., Ell., etc.), is that it is a quotation from the OT, as the formula **λέγει** indicates, and in fact a very free reproduction and application of Isa. lx. 1. The difficulty lies in the extreme freedom with which the original words are handled. There is but a very slender resemblance between what we have here and the LXX version of the prophetic verse, *viz.*, **φωτίζου, φωτίζου, Ἰερουσαλήμ, ἥκει γάρ σου τὸ φῶς καὶ ἡ δόξα Κυρίου ἐπί σε ἀνατέταλκεν.** Nor should we have a different condition, if we supposed Paul in this case to have followed the Hebrew text. Hence some (Beza, etc.) imagine that Paul has combined with Isa. lx. 1 other Isaianic passages (*e.g.*, ix. 1, xxvi. 19, lii. 1). But while it is true that Paul does elsewhere use great liberty in modifying, combining, and applying OT passages, it cannot be said either that these words of Isaiah have much relation to the quotation, or that we have in Paul's writings (even Rom. x. 6, etc., not excepted) any case quite parallel to this. Others, therefore, conclude that the passage is from some apocryphal writing, the *Apocalypse of Elias* (Epiph.), a prophecy under the name of *Jeremiah* (Geor. Syncell.), one of the writings attributed to *Enoch* (Cod. G, margin). But though Paul *might* have quoted from an apocryphal book, and some think he has done it, *e.g.*, in 1 Cor. ii. 9, it is certain that his habit is to quote only from the OT, and further this formula of citation appears always to introduce an OT passage. Meyer tries to solve the difficulty by the somewhat far-fetched supposition that Paul really quoted from some apocryphal writing, but by a lapse of memory took it for a part of canonical Scripture. Others suggest that he is quoting a saying of our Lord not recorded in the Gospels (*cf.* Resch., *Agrapha*, pp. 222, 289), or a *baptismal formula*, or some *hymn* (Mich., Storr, etc.). The choice must be between the first-mentioned explanation and the last. Notwithstanding the confessed difficulties of the case, there is not a little to incline us to the idea that, although in a very inexact and unusual form, we have a biblical quotation before us here. On the other hand it is urged (*e.g.*, by Haupt) with some force that the rhythmical character of the passage favours the supposition that we have here a snatch from some very ancient hymn or liturgical composition. The question must be confessed to be still open. But what in any case is the *point* of the quotation here? The passage is introduced in connection with the reference to the *effects* of a faithful **ἔλεγξις** and under the impression of the figure of the *light*. It takes the form of an appeal to wake out of the pagan condition of sin, described by the twofold figure of *sleep* and *death*, and of a promise that then Christ will shine upon the sinner with the saving light of His truth. The quotation comes in relevantly, therefore, as a further enforcement both of the need for the *reproof* which is enjoined, and of the good effects of such a *reproof* faithfully exercised.

Vv. 15-21. A paragraph closely connected with the former, and specifying various things belonging to the correctness and consistency of the Christian walk.

Ver. 15. **βλέπετε οὖν πῶς ἀκριβῶς [ἀκριβῶς πως] περιπατεῖτε**: *take heed then how ye walk with strictness* [or, *take heed carefully how ye walk*]. The writer passes from the statement of the need of the **ἔλεγξις** and its profitable effects into which he had been led for a space, and returns to the exhortation of ver. 8. The **οὖν** has its *resumptive* force here; as indeed it is a particle not so much of *inference* as of "continuation and retrospection" (Donald.), and is better rendered "then," "accordingly," "to proceed," than "therefore" (see Win.-Moult., p. 553; Ell. on Gal. iii. 5; and especially Donaldson, *Greek Gram.*, p. 571). It is out of place to give **βλέπετε** any such sense as "make use of the light so as to see," as if it had regard to the **φῶς** previously mentioned. It has the simple force of "take heed," as in Matt. xiii. 23, 33; 1 Cor. x. 7; Phil. iii. 2; Col. iv. 17. It is followed by **πῶς** again in Luke viii. 18; 1 Cor. iii. 10. The particular shade of meaning attributable to **ἀκριβῶς** here turns in some degree on the reading. The TR gives **πῶς ἀκριβῶς,** following $\aleph^{c}$ADGKLP and most MSS., with the Vulg., Syr., Arm. Versions, and such Fathers as Theodor., Jerome, etc. If this order is adopted **ἀκριβῶς,** which = "exactly," "diligently" (Matt. ii. 8; Luke i. 3; Acts xviii. 25; 1 Thess. v. 2), will express the idea of strict conformity to a standard, carefulness against any departure from what is proper to a Christian walk. So the AV and other old

περιπατεῖτε, μὴ ὡς [a] ἄσοφοι, ἀλλ' ὡς σοφοί, 16. [b] ἐξαγοραζόμενοι [a] Here only.
τὸν [c] καιρόν, ὅτι αἱ [d] ἡμέραι [e] πονηραί εἰσιν. 17. διὰ τοῦτο μὴ [b] Gal. iii. 13, iv. 5; Col. iv. 5 only.

[b c] Col. iv. 5; Dan. ii. 8. [d] = 2 Tim. iii. 1; Heb. x. 32; 1 Pet. iii. 10.
[d e] Ps. xl. 1. [e] = Gal. i. 4; ch. vi. 13.

English Versions render it "circumspectly" or (Wicl., Rhem.) "warily"—a very good translation. In B ℵ*17, Origen, etc., the order is **ἀκριβῶς πῶς**, and this is adopted by TTr marg. WHRV. In that case the injunction loses its distinctive note, and instead of the charge to take heed how they walked "with strict carefulness," we have the plain exhortation to "take heed carefully" how they walked. The **πῶς** in either case should have its proper sense "how" (as in Cran., Cov., Rhem. and similarly Wicl.), not "that" (as in AV and the rest of the old English Versions). Further, the **περιπατεῖτε** is not an indic. with a *conjunctive* force, as if = "take heed how ye *should* walk," but a proper indic.; the point being the need of looking carefully at the way in which the Christian walk was being carried out there and then. See Win.-Moult., p. 376, and *cf.* **ἕκαστος βλεπέτω πῶς οἰκοδομεῖ** in 1 Cor. iii. 10. —**μὴ ὡς ἄσοφοι, ἀλλ' ὡς σοφοί**: *not as unwise, but as wise.* Some think that some such term as **περιπατοῦντες** must be supplied here. But it is unnecessary, the **μὴ ὡς ἄσοφοι** being dependent on the **πῶς περιπατεῖτε** and explanatory of it, = "how ye walk, *to wit*, not as unwise, but as wise". The subjective negative **μή** is in point because the whole sentence is also dependent on the **βλέπετε**. The nature of the walk to be consistently pursued is placed in the stronger light by the antithetic parallelism; a form especially characteristic of the Johannine writings; *cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 762. They were to walk as those who had the character (**ὡς**) not of fools, but of wise men.

Ver. 16. **ἐξαγοραζόμενοι τὸν καιρόν**: *buying up for yourselves the opportunity.* Definition of the **ὡς σοφοί**, specifying the way in which they were to give token of the quality of wisdom. The expression occurs only once again in the NT (in Col. iv. 5); and there are but few proper parallels to it. The phrase as used in Dan. ii. 8 has rather the sense of *gaining time, delaying*. The classical phrase **καιρὸν πρίασθαι** (used, *e.g.*, by Demosthenes) has the plain meaning of purchasing for money. Even the **κερδαντέον τὸ παρόν** cited from Anton., vi., 26, and the **καιρὸν ἁρπάζειν** of Plut. (*Philop.*, 15) are but partial analogies. In the NT the verb **ἐξαγοράζειν** has at times the sense of *redeeming*, ransoming one from another by payment of a price, and so it is applied to Christ's vicarious death (Gal. iii. 13, iv. 5). It has the sense of *ransoming* occasionally in profane Greek (*e.g.*, Diodor., 36, 1, p. 530). Hence some take the idea here to be that of *redeeming*, as from the power of Satan (Calv.), or from the power of evil men (Beng.); the sacrifice of earthly things being taken by some (Chrys. Theophyl., Oec., etc.) to be the purchase-price. But it is doubtful whether any such technical or metaphorical sense can be attached to the word here, where the subject in view is the plain duty of a careful Christian walk. The simpler sense of *buying* is more appropriate to the context. The **ἐξ-** probably has its intensive force, although Ellicott takes it to refer merely to the "undefined time or circumstances, *out of* which, in each particular case, the **καιρός** is to be bought". Giving the Middle also its proper sense, we get the sense of "buying up for yourselves". The thing to be "bought up" is the **καιρός**, not "the time," but "the *fit* time," the "opportunity," and the purchase-money implied in the figure is left undefined, but may be the *careful heed* expended on their walk. Thus the sense comes to be this—the character of wisdom by which their walk was to be distinguished was to show itself in the prompt and discerning zeal with which they made every opportunity their own, and suffered no fitting season for the fulfilment of Christian duty to pass unused. Luther's "suit yourselves to the time" would require some such phrase as **δουλεύειν τῷ καιρῷ** (Rom. xii. 11), and is otherwise inappropriate. Other explanations, such as Harless's supposition that the matter in view is the fit time for letting the **ἔλεγξις** break in upon the darkness of sin, are remote from the immediate subject or impart ideas which are not in the text. The RV gives "redeeming the time" in the text, and "buying up the opportunity" in the margin.—**ὅτι αἱ ἡμέραι πονηραί εἰσι**: *because the days are evil.* Statement of motive for buying up the opportunity, *viz.*, the evil of the time. The context makes it clear that what is in view is the moral evil of the days, not merely as, *e.g.*, in Gen.

f Luke xi. 40, xii. 20; Rom. ii. 20 al.; Paul only, exc. 1 Pet. ii. 15; Job v. 3. g Acts xxi. 14 only; elsw. τοῦ θεοῦ. h Luke xii. 45; 1 Thess. v. 7 only. i Tit. i. 6; 1 Pet. iv. 4 only; Prov. xxviii. 7; 2 Macc. iv. 6. k = Acts xiii. 52; Rom. i. 29, xv. 13 al.

f γίνεσθε ἄφρονες, ἀλλὰ συνιόντες [1] τί τὸ g θέλημα τοῦ g κυρίου.[2] 18. καὶ μὴ h μεθύσκεσθε οἴνῳ, ἐν ᾧ ἐστιν i ἀσωτία, ἀλλὰ [3] k πλη-

[1] συνιεντες D[3]EKL, mss., nearly, Syr., Arm., Eth., al., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., etc.; συνιετε ℵABP 67[2], 73, 118, Chr.-ms., Jer.; συνιοντες DFG (It., Vulg., Goth., Syr., all, Lucif., all).

[2] After κυρ. insert ημων B; for κυρ., θεου A 14, 55, 66[2], 109-15-78, d, e, f, Syr., Thl., Jer., Aug.-Pel.

[3] αλλα μαλλον 10, 37, 71, 116, Arm.

xlvii. 9, their difficulties and troubles (Beza, etc.). The fact that the times in which they lived were morally so corrupt was a strong reason for making every opportunity for good, which such times might offer, their own.

Ver. 17. **διὰ τοῦτο μὴ γίνεσθε ἄφρονες**: *for this cause become not ye foolish.* The **διὰ τοῦτο** *may* refer to the immediately preceding clause (Rück., De Wette, etc.), the evil of the days being a reason for avoiding folly. It is better, however, to refer it to the main idea, that of the *walk*, than to the subordinate. The manner of walk which they were called to pursue required the cultivation of wisdom, not of folly. The **γίνεσθε**, again, is not to be reduced to the sense of **ἐστε**. Contemplating them as in the Christian position Paul charges them not to suffer themselves to slip back again into folly—a thing inconsistent with the walk required of the Christian. **ἄφρονες** is a strong term = without reason, senseless, lacking moral intelligence.—**ἀλλὰ συνιέντες** [**συνίετε**] **τί τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Κυρίου**: *but understanding* [*understand*] *what the will of the Lord is.* The reading varies here between **συνιέντες**, as in TR, with D[3]EKL and the mass of MSS., Vulg., Syr.-P., etc.; **συνιόντες**, with D*G, etc.; and **συνίετε**, with BℵAP 17, etc., which is adopted by LTTr WHRV. For **Κυρίου** Lachmann gives **θεοῦ** in the margin, but on slight authority. The **Κύριος**, as in Acts xxi. 14; 1 Cor. iv. 19, is *Christ.* As distinguished from **γινώσκειν**, **συνιέναι** expresses *intelligent, comprehending* knowledge, more than acquaintance with a thing or mere matter of fact knowledge.

Ver. 18. **καὶ μὴ μεθύσκεσθε οἴνῳ**: *and be not made drunk with wine.* A particular case of the **ἀφροσύνη** to be avoided is now mentioned. The **καί** is used here, as, *e.g.*, also in Mark i. 5, to add a *special* designation to a *general, inclusive* statement; Win.-Moult., p. 546. The case is the abuse of wine. But there is nothing to suggest any reference to excess at the *Agapae* (1 Cor. xi. 21) in especial. **ἐν ᾧ ἐστιν ἀσωτία**: *wherein is dissoluteness.* Or, with the RV, "wherein is riot". The AV, Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish., all give "excess"; Wicl. has *lechery*, and the Rhem. *riotousness.* **ἀσωτία** (*cf.* Prov. xxviii. 7) expresses the idea of an *abandoned, debauched* life; literally, the condition of one who is past salvation. The **ἐν ᾧ** refers not to the **οἶνος** alone (which might infer a Gnostic view of matter or Montanistic, ascetic ideas of life), but to the whole phrase **μεθύσκεσθε οἴνῳ**—the becoming *drunk* with wine.—**ἀλλὰ πληροῦσθε ἐν Πνεύματι**: *but be filled with the Spirit.* The verb **πληροῦν** is construed with the *gen.* of the thing that fills (*e.g.*, Acts ii. 28, v. 28, xiii. 52, *pass.*, etc.); or with the Hebraistic *acc.* (Col. i. 9); or with the *dat.* (Rom. i. 29; 2 Cor. vii. 4, etc.). The construction with **ἐν** here is exceptional. Hence some prefer to understand **πνεύματι** of man's spirit, and render it (as RV margin) "be filled in spirit". The contrast would then be between being filled in one's physical or carnal nature and filled in one's spiritual nature (so Braune, and in effect Abb.). In NT Greek, however, verbs that are followed by the simple dat. sometimes vary it by a prepositional form, *e.g.*, **βαπτίζεσθαι ὕδατι** (Luke iii. 16) and **ἐν ὕδατι** (Matt. iii. 11), **παντὶ τρόπῳ** (Phil i. 18) and **ἐν παντὶ τρόπῳ** (2 Thess. ii. 16), etc.; and the formula **πληροῦν** or **πληροῦσθαι ἐν** is not wholly without analogy; *cf.* **τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου**, i. 23 above; and Col. iv. 12, **πεπληροφορημένοι ἐν παντὶ θελήματι τοῦ Θεοῦ**, where indeed the **πεπληρωμένοι** of the TR must give place to another verb, yet one with the same idea, the sense being probably "filled *with* everything willed by God" (*cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 272; Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 117). The **ἐν** may be taken, therefore, as the *instrum.* **ἐν**, and

ροῦσθε ἐν [1]πνεύματι,[1] 19. λαλοῦντες [m]ἑαυτοῖς [n]ψαλμοῖς[2] καὶ [o]ὕμνοις 1 Const., Rom. x. 20.
καὶ [p]ᾠδαῖς [[q]πνευματικαῖς[3]], [r]ᾄδοντες καὶ [s]ψάλλοντες ἐν τῇ [t]καρδίᾳ[4] m=Ch. iv.

32 reff. n=Col. iii. 16; 1 Cor. xiv. 26. o Col. iii. 16 only; Neh. xii. 46. p Col. iii. 16; Rev. v. 9 al. only; Exod. xv. 1 al. q Rom. i. 11 al. Paul only, exc. 1 Pet. ii. 5. r Col. iii. 16; Rev. v. 9, xiv. 3, xv. 3 only; Jer. xxxvii. 19. s Rom. xv. 9; 1 Cor. xiv. 15; James v. 13 only; 1 Kings xvi. 16. t=Acts vii. 54; Rom. ii. 15, 29, x. 6; 1 Cor. vii. 37 al.

[1] **εν τω πνευματι** FG; add **αγιω** Eth., Arm.

[2] **εν ψαλ.** B, D.-lat., 17, 67², 73, 116-18, Vulg., Chr., Ambrst., Jer., Pel.

[3] After **ωδαις** om. **πνευματικαις** B, d, e, Ambrst.-ed.; add **εν χαριτι** A. **εν ταις καρδιαις** ℵ³ADEFGP 47, It., Vulg., Goth., Syr., Syr.-marg., al., Bas., Chr.₂, Lat. Fathers.

[4] **τη καρδια** ℵB, Orig.; **εν τη καρδια** KL and most MSS., Syr.-P., Arm., Eth., Chr., Euth., Thdrt., Dam., Theophyl.

the sense will be "filled *with* or *by* the Spirit". Some (*e.g.*, Ell., Alf.) would combine the ideas of *in* and *by*, supposing the unusual phrase to be chosen with a view to convey the fact that the Holy Spirit is not only the instrument *by* which the Christian man is filled, but that also *in* which he is so filled. But this is a needless refinement. The contrast, as most commentators recognise, is not merely between the **οἴνῳ** and the **πνεύματι,** but between the **μεθύσκεσθε** and the **πληροῦσθε.** Otherwise the order would have been **μὴ οἴνῳ μεθύσκεσθε, ἀλλ' ἐν πνεύματι πληροῦσθε** (Mey.). The contrast is not between the *instruments* but between the *states*—between two elevated states, one due to the excitement of wine, the other to the inspiration and enlightenment of the Spirit.

Ver. 19. **λαλοῦντες ἑαυτοῖς ψαλμοῖς καὶ ὕμνοις καὶ ᾠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς**: *speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs.* Lachm. inserts **ἐν** before **ψαλμοῖς**; Tr and WH place it in the margin, on the authority of BP 17, 67², Vulg., Jer. **πνευματικαῖς** is bracketed by Lach., but is to be retained, as being found in all authorities with the exception of a very few—B, *d*, *e*, etc. The AV and the other old English Versions render **ἑαυτοῖς** "yourselves," and the RV gives this a place in the margin. But in all probability **ἑαυτοῖς** has the reciprocal sense = **ἀλλήλοις,** as in iv. 32 (*cf.* Jelf, *Greek Gram.*, § 654, 2). The idea is not that of *meditation*, but that of *converse.* There is nothing, however, to suggest the thought of actual *worship.* The sentence specifies one of the ways in which the condition of being "filled with the Spirit" would express itself. In their intercourse one with another their language would not be that of ordinary convention, far less that of base intoxication, but that of spiritual devotion and thankfulness. Reference is made by many commentators to Pliny's well-known report of the practice of the Christians of Bithynia and Pontus—carmen Christo quasi Deo dicunt *secum invicem* (Ep., x., 97); but what is in view there is responsive praise in the Lord's Day worship. *Psalms*, *hymns*, and *spiritual songs* are mentioned again in Col. iii. 16. What the distinctions are, if any, between the three terms has been considerably disputed. **ψαλμός** is a religious song, especially one sung to a musical accompaniment, and *par excellence* an OT psalm; **ὕμνος** is properly speaking a song of *praise*; **ᾠδή** is the most general term, applicable to all kinds of songs, secular or sacred, accompanied or unaccompanied (*cf.* Trench, *Syn.*, p. 279; Light. on Col. iii. 16). The three words are brought together here with a view to rhetorical force, and it is precarious, therefore, to build much upon supposed differences between them. There is nothing to warrant Harless's idea that the **ψαλμός** is the spiritual song for *Jewish*-Christians and the **ὕμνος** for *Gentile*-Christians; or Olshausen's supposition that the term **ψαλμοῖς** is to be limited to the OT psalms which had passed over into the Christian Church. There were *Christian* psalms—psalms which the Holy Spirit moved the primitive Christians to utter when they came together in worship (1 Cor. xiv. 15, 26), as He moved them to speak with tongues (Acts ii. 4, x. 46, xix. 6). It is probable, therefore, that these are intended here, especially in view of what has been said of being "filled by the Spirit". If the terms, therefore, are to be distinguished at all, the case will be simply this—that the **ψαλμοί** and the **ὕμνοι** are specific kinds of **ᾠδαὶ πνευματικαί,** and that the former are the Christian psalms which worshippers were inspired to sing, and which no doubt would be like the familiar psalms

u=Luke xvii. 16, xviii. 11; John xi. 41; Rom. i. 8 and freq. Paul; Rev. xi. 17. v 2 Cor. ix. 8; Phil. i. 4; 1 Thess. i. 2; Paul only. u v 1 Cor. i. 4; 1 Thess. i. 2; 2 Thess. i. 3; Paul only. w James i. 27.

ὑμῶν τῷ κυρίῳ, 20. [u]εὐχαριστοῦντες [v]πάντοτε ὑπὲρ [v]πάντων ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ [w]τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρί,[1]

[1] πα. κ. θ. DEFG, al.$_{2}$, It., Goth., Vig.

of Israel, while the latter were songs of praise to Christ or to God. On this view the adj. **πνευματικαῖς** is attached to the **ᾠδαῖς** not merely to differentiate these **ᾠδαί** as religious and not secular, but to describe them as inspired by the Holy Ghost.—**ᾄδοντες καὶ ψάλλοντες ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ**: *singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord.* The **ἐν** of the TR is supported by KL, most cursives, Syr.-Harcl., Arm., etc. It is omitted by B$\aleph$*, Orig., etc., and is deleted by L^{t}[Tr]WHRV. For **τῇ καρδίᾳ**, Lachm. prefers **ταῖς καρδίαις**, which is given by $\aleph^{3}$ADGP, Vulg., Boh., Syr. **ψάλλοντες**, properly = *playing* on a stringed instrument, and then = *singing*, especially to an instrument (Rom. xv. 9; 1 Cor. xiv. 15; James v. 13). The **τῷ Κυρίῳ** will have its usual reference, *viz.*, to *Christ*. The question, however, is whether this clause is to be taken as *coordinate* or as *subordinate*. Does it *add* something to the previous **λαλοῦντες** clause, or simply explain and extend it? The latter view has been accepted by many from Theodoret downwards, who understand the point here to be that the speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs was not to be a formal thing or a matter of the lips only, but the utterance of the heart, "with the heart" (RV). But this would be expressed rather by **ἐκ τῆς καρδίας** or **κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν**. The rendering "heartily" also would be easier if there were no **ὑμῶν**. Besides the contrast in the context is not between lip-praise and heart-praise on the part of Christians, but between Christian converse expressing itself in praise, and the vain or profligate talk of the heathen. Hence (with Harl., Mey., Ell., Alf.), it is best to give **ἐν** its proper sense of *in*, and to understand the clause as referring to the melody that takes place in the stillness of the heart. It specifies a second kind of praise in addition to that of the **λαλοῦντες**—the unvoiced praise of meditation and inward worship.

Ver. 20. **εὐχαριστοῦντες πάντοτε ὑπὲρ πάντων**: *giving thanks always for all things*. Another *coordinate* clause giving a third and more particular way in which the being "filled with the Spirit" should express itself. The two preceding sentences referred to *praise*, both outwardly with the mouth and inwardly in the silence of the heart. This third sentence mentions a special form of praise, *viz.*, *thanksgiving*. This thanksgiving is described as a *constant* duty, the **πάντοτε** which would have been inappropriate with the **λαλοῦντες** and with the **ᾄδοντες καὶ ψάλλοντες** being in place here where, as in the case of *joy* and *prayer* (1 Thess. v. 16, 17), the matter is one primarily of attitude or spirit. The **ὑπὲρ πάντων**, "for all things" (neut., not masc., as understood by Theodor.), is taken by many in its widest possible extent, as including things evil as well as good. The Epistle does not deal, however, particularly with the *sufferings* of the Christian, but with what he receives from God and what his consequent duty is. It is most accordant, therefore, with the context to understand the **πάντων** as referring to all the *blessings* of the Christian, the whole good that comes to him from God.—**ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ**: *in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ*. The phrase **ἐν ὀνόματι . . . Χριστοῦ** is different from **ἐν Χριστῷ** and of wider application. It has different shades of meaning, *authority*, *power*, *honour*, *dependence*, etc., in different connections. Here probably it expresses the idea of doing something *in dependence* upon Christ, or *in regardfulness* of what Christ is; *cf.* John xiv. 13, xv. 16, xvi. 23; Col. iii. 7.—**τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρί**: *to God and the Father*. The RV gives "to God, even the Father" in its text, and "to the God and Father" in the margin. But the most appropriate rendering of the title is the above. The title designates One who is *God and at the same time Father;* the Fatherhood here, as elsewhere, being no doubt primarily the relation to Christ, as is suggested by the **ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι**, etc.

Ver. 21. **ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις**: *subjecting yourselves one to another*. The connection of this clause is by no means clear. It is taken by not a few (Calv., Matthies, etc.) as an independent clause, the participle being dealt with as an imperative. But there is nothing to suggest the **ἐστε** which would have to be supplied.

21. [x] ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις ἐν φόβῳ χριστοῦ[1]· 22. αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν[2] ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ, 23. ὅτι ἀνήρ[3] ἐστιν [y] κεφαλὴ τῆς

x Ch. i. 22 reff.

y = 1 Cor. xi. 3; ch. i. 22, iv. 15; Col. i. 18; Paul only

[1] Χριστου ℵABLP, most others, f, Vulg., Syr., Copt., Arm., Eth., Goth., Orig., Bas., Chrys., Dam., Victorin., etc.; Χριστου Ιησου DE 35, d, e; Ιησου Χριστου Fgr.G, g; κυριου K; θεου most cursives, Clem., Euth., Thdrt., Dam.

[2] After ανδρ. insert υποτασσεσθε KL, al., Chr.; before ιδ. DF, Syr.; υποτασσεσθωσαν ℵAP 17, 57, fere al., Vulg., Copt., Clem.$_1$, Bas., Thdrt., Dam., Lat. Fathers; without υποτασσεσθαι or υποτασσεσθωσαν B, MSS. in Jerome: (*Hoc quod in lat. exx. additum est, subditae sint, in gr. edd. non habetur. . . . Sed hoc magis in graeco intelligitur quam in latino*), Clem.

[3] ο ανηρ some cursives, Clem., Chr., Thdrt., etc.; ανηρ ℵADEFGKLP 44, 106 to 11-53-77-6-9, 219-38, all, Dam.

To relate the clause to the paragraph which *follows* means that it is the introductory, *general* statement, of which we have a particular application in what is said of the **γυναῖκες.** But in that case we should expect the duty of the **γυναῖκες** to be conveyed by a noun distinct from **ὑποτασσόμενοι,** but denoting a form of behaviour that would come easily under the comprehensive duty expressed by the participle. It is best to connect the clause, therefore, with what *precedes* it, and to take it as a *fourth coordinate* clause, giving yet another way in which the condition of being "filled with the Spirit" should express itself. The former three dealt with spiritual converse, praise, and thanksgiving; this one deals with what is due from ourselves to others. It is appended to the other three as a summary statement of duty in our relations one to another, of which particular applications are to be made. Thus it leads easily on to the special obligations which are next enforced. The same comprehensive statement of Christian duty in our earthly relations as summed up in the one idea of mutual **ὑπόταξις,** in contrast with pagan self-seeking and self-assertion, is given in 1 Pet. v. 5.—**ἐν φόβῳ Θεοῦ** [**Χριστοῦ**]: *in the fear of God* [*of Christ*]. The reading of the TR, **Θεοῦ,** is that mostly of the cursives and a few Fathers. It must give place to **Χριστοῦ,** which is given by BℵALP, Vulg., Syr., Boh., etc., and is accepted by LTTrWHRV. Other variations occur, *e.g.*, **Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ** in D and **Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ** in G. The phrase "in the fear of Christ" occurs only this once. Reverence for the Lord Himself was the spirit in which this great duty of mutual subjection was to be fulfilled.

Vv. 22-33. A paragraph which, in dealing with the duties of wives and husbands as seen in the new light of Christian truth, gives the Christian ideal of the marriage-relation. It is the loftiest conception of that relation that has ever come from human pen, and one than which no higher can be imagined.

Ver. 22. **Αἱ γυναῖκες, τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν** [**ὑποτάσσεσθε**]: *Wives, be in subjection to your own husbands.* The great Christian law of mutual subjection or submissive consideration is now to be unfolded in its bearing on three particular relations which lie at the foundation of man's social life—those of husbands and wives, parents and children, masters and servants. The relation of husbands and wives, as the most fundamental, is taken up before the others, and the Christian duty of the wives is set forth first. The reading is somewhat uncertain. The TR inserts **ὑποτάσσεσθε,** with KL, most cursives, Syr., Chrys., etc. A few manuscripts (DG) place the **ὑποτάσσεσθε** after the **γυναῖκες.** In some important authorities (ℵAP 17, Boh., Goth., Vulg., Arm., etc.) we find **ὑποτασσέσθωσαν;** which is accepted by LTr and given a place in the margin by WH. The clause is given without any verb by B, Clem., and Jer., which last states that the verb was not found in his *Greek* codices. This shortest form is adopted by WH in their *text.* The verb is easily supplied from the preceding **ὑποτασσόμενοι,** and such constructions are quite in Paul's style. The **ἰδίοις** (which is omitted in the parallel passage in Col. iii. 18) is here, as often if not always in the NT, something more than a simple possessive. It conveys the idea of what is *special,* and gives a certain note of emphasis or intensity, = husbands who as such are peculiarly and exclusively *theirs;* see 1 Pet. iii. 1, and *cf.* Ell. *in loc.*; Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek,* p. 169.—**ὡς τῷ Κυρίῳ**: *as to the Lord.* That is, *to Christ;* not to the *husband* as lord and

z Ch. i. 23 γυναικὸς ὡς καὶ ὁ χριστὸς κεφαλὴ τῆς [z]ἐκκλησίας, αὐτὸς [1] [a]σωτὴρ
reff.
a=Constr., τοῦ σώματος. 24. ἀλλ' ὡς [2] ἡ ἐκκλησία [x]ὑποτάσσεται τῷ χριστῷ,
1 Tim. iv.
10; John iv. 42; 1 John iv. 14.

[1] και αυτος εστιν ℵ[3]D[2,3]E[2]KLP, Syr., Arm., Goth., Bas., Chr., Thdrt., etc.; αυτος alone ℵ*ABD*E*FG 72, 73, 112, 178, d, e, f, g, Vulg., Copt., Clem., Euth., Orig., Victorin., etc.

[2] ως ℵAD*FGP 17, 31, 47, 67[2], 73, Clem., Orig., Chr., Euth., etc.; ωσπερ D[3]EKL, al., pler., Bas., Thdrt., Dam., etc.

master. If the husband's supremacy had been in view, it would have been expressed by **τοῖς κυρίοις**. The **ὡς** denotes more than *similarly*, and more than "just as they are submissive to Christ so should they be to their husbands". The next sentence, and the whole statement of the relation between husband and wife in the following verse in terms of the relation between Christ and the Church, suggest that the point of the **ὡς** is that the wife is to regard the obedience she has to render to her husband as an obedience rendered to Christ, the Christian husband being head of the wife and representing to her Christ the Head of the whole Christian body.

Ver. 23. **ὅτι ὁ ἀνήρ ἐστι κεφαλὴ τῆς γυναικός, ὡς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας**: *because the husband is the head of the wife, as also Christ is the head of the Church.* Reason for a wifely subjection of the kind indicated. It is found in the relation of headship. In the marriage union the husband holds the same relation, *viz.*, that of headship, as Christ holds to the Church, and the headship of the one represents the headship of the other. For **ἐστι κεφαλή**, B, Vulg., etc., give **κεφαλή ἐστιν**, which WH place in the margin. The **ὁ** before **ἀνήρ** rests on the slenderest authority, and is omitted by LTTrWHRV on the testimony of BℵA DFKL, etc. The anarthrous **ἀνήρ** means "a husband" in the sense of any man belonging to the class of husbands. The article, again, is appropriate in **τῆς γυναικός**, as a definite relation is expressed there="a husband is head of *his* wife". The **ὡς καί** indicates the point common to the two subjects—each is *head*, though in relation to different objects.—**[καὶ] αὐτός [ἐστι] σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος**: *and He is Himself the Saviour of the body.* The **καί** and the **ἐστι** of the TR have considerable authority (ℵ[3]D[2,3]KLP, most cursives, Syr., Arm., etc.); but they are not found in BℵA*DG, Vulg., etc., and are to be omitted (with LTTrWHRV). The clause then might be construed as in *apposition* to the previous **ὁ Χριστός**, = "as Christ is the Head of the Church—He, the Saviour of the body". But it is best taken as an *independent* clause, stating in a definite and emphatic way an important point in which Christ, who resembles the husband in respect of *headship*, at the same time *differs* from the husband. It is best rendered, therefore, "He, He Himself (*i.e.*, = He alone) is the Saviour of the body". The RV less happily makes it "being Himself the Saviour of the body". The **αὐτός** can only be *Christ*, and the **σῶμα** is the *Church*—the body to which He brings salvation. The husband is head of the wife, and in that he is like Christ; but Christ is also that which the husband is not, *viz.*, *Saviour* of that whereof He is Head.

Ver. 24. **ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἡ ἐκκλησία ὑποτάσσεται τῷ Χριστῷ, οὕτως καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν ἐν παντί**: *nevertheless as the Church is subject to Christ, so also let the wives be subject to their husbands in everything.* For **ἀλλ'** the best editors give **ἀλλά**. For the **ὥσπερ** of the TR, supported by D[3]KL and most cursives, read (with LTTrWHRV) **ὡς**, which is found in ℵAD*GP, 17, 67[2], etc. But B omits it. The **ἰδίοις** inserted by TR (after AD[3]KLP and various Versions, etc.) before **ἀνδράσιν** is wanting in BℵD*G, 17, 67[2], etc., and should be deleted. It has crept in probably from ver. 22. The question here is as to the force of the **ἀλλά**. Some suppose a suppressed negation before it, *e.g.*, "be not disobedient," "do not disallow the marital headship, *but*," etc. (Eadie). Others give it a resumptive force (Harl., etc.). But the supposed digression, which can only be the brief clause **αὐτὸς σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος**, requires no such resumption. Others give it a certain syllogistic force, understanding it to introduce a *proof* of the preceding statement, presenting the relation in a new light, or an inference from the statement (De Wette, Olsh.); but **ἀλλά** does not draw *conclusions* like **οὖν**, nor is it = **ὥστε**, although it may introduce a *minor proposition*; *cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 291; Hartung, *Partikl.*,

οὕτως καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς[1] ἀνδράσιν ἐν παντί. 25. οἱ ἄνδρες, ἀγαπᾶτε τὰς γυναῖκας ἑαυτῶν,[2] καθὼς καὶ ὁ χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ [b] ἑαυτὸν [b] παρέδωκεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς, 26. ἵνα αὐτὴν b Ver. 2 reff.

[1] Before ανδρ. insert ιδιοις AD^{3}E^{2}KLP, etc., Vss., Fathers; om. ℵBD*E*FG 17, 67^2, It.

[2] εαυτων om. ℵAB 5, 17, 23, 49, 57, 70, Clem.$_1$, Orig., Cyr., Chr.$_2$; insert DEKL, etc. (τας εαυ. Clem.$_1$), Chr., Thdrt.$_2$, al.; add υμων FG, Thdrt.$_1$.

ii., p. 384. Others make it = "*but then*, which is the main thing," etc., supposing ver. 24 to give a second proof of the fact that wives should be obedient to their husbands *as to the Lord*—a proof drawn from the position held by Christ and by the husband, *viz.*, that of being *head* (Win.-Moult., p. 565). This, however, would be expressed rather by **δέ** than by **ἀλλά**, the former being the particle that in *opposing* also *continues* and *connects*, adding something distinct from what has preceded, while the latter has the full *opposing* significance, disannulling or discounting something mentioned before (Win.-Moult., p. 551). The **ἀλλά**, therefore, must have its full *adversative* force, and is best rendered "nevertheless," "for all that". The twenty-fourth verse thus looks to the peculiarity mentioned as belonging to Christ's headship in distinction from the husband's, *viz.*, the fact that He is not only Head, but Saviour. And the idea becomes this—"Christ indeed is Saviour of the body, and that the husband is not; nevertheless the question of *obedience* is not affected thereby; for all that, as the Church is subject to Christ, so too are wives to be subject to their husbands" (so subst. Calv., Beng., Mey., Ell., Alf., etc.). In the **οὕτως** clause **ὑποτασσέσθωσαν**, "*let* the wives be subject," as in RV text and according to most commentators, or better, **ὑποτάσσονται**, "so are the wives also" (as in RV marg.), is to be supplied from the preceding **ὑποτάσσεται**. The **ἐν παντί** naturally means in everything pertaining to the marriage-relation.

Ver. 25. **οἱ ἄνδρες, ἀγαπᾶτε τὰς γυναῖκας [ἑαυτῶν], καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἠγάπησε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν**: *husbands, love your wives, even as also Christ loved the Church.* The reflexive **ἑαυτῶν** introduced by the TR after **γυναῖκας**, as in DKL, Syr., etc., is not found in BℵA, 17, Clem., etc., and is properly omitted by LTTr WHRV. The reading **ὑμῶν** also occurs in G. We have now the statement of the corresponding duty of husbands. If the wife's duty is submission, the husband's is love—a love like Christ's—a love capable even of suffering and dying for the wife as Christ did for the Church.—**καὶ ἑαυτὸν παρέδωκεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς**: *and gave Himself up for it.* **παρέδωκεν**, as in v. 2, Gal. ii. 20 (**παραδόντος ἑαυτόν**), Rom. iv. 25 (**παρεδόθη**), without explanation of that to which He gave Himself; that being understood to be *death.* This is the measure, therefore, of Christ's love, and this is the manner of love with which the husband is to meet the wife's obedience.

Ver. 26. **ἵνα αὐτὴν ἁγιάσῃ**: *that He might sanctify it.* Statement of the great object with which Christ in His love for the Church gave Himself up to death for it. An object worthy of the self-sacrifice, described in definite terms and with a solemn significance—the sanctification and cleansing of the Church with a view to its final presentation in perfect holiness at the great day. The verb **ἁγιάζειν**, a later form of **ἁγίζειν** (used, *e.g.*, by Soph., *Oed. Col.*, 1495; Pindar, *O.*, iii., 34, etc.), frequent in biblical and patristic Greek, means to *set apart* to a sacred use, to *consecrate*, by external or ceremonial cleansing (Heb. ix. 13; 1 Tim. iv. 5); by an *expiation* (1 Cor. vi. 11; Heb. x. 10, 14, 29); or by inward, *ethical* purification (1 Thess. v. 23). Most exegetes take **ἁγιάσῃ** in the third sense here, and this is favoured by the terms which follow in ver. 27. On the other hand, both in the Pauline writings and in the Epistle to the Hebrews (*cf.* Pfleiderer, *Paulinism*, Engl. transl., vol. ii., 68, etc.) the dominant application of the verb is deliverance from the *guilt* of sin by means of an expiation.—**καθαρίσας**: *cleansing it.* The verb **καθαρίζειν**, Hellenistic for **καθαίρειν**, has certain occasional applications in the NT (*e.g.*, *literal* cleansing, Matt. xxiii. 26; Luke xi. 39; pronouncing *ceremonially* clean, Acts x. 15, xi. 9; *consecrating* by cleansing, Heb. ix. 22, 23); but apart from these it has two main senses—that of *ethical* purification (2 Cor. vii. 1; James iv. 8), and that of *forgiveness*, freeing from the *guilt* of sin (Tit. ii. 14; Heb. ix. 14; 1 John i. 7, 9). In the case of this verb,

again, the prevailing idea is that of the changed, rectified *relation* to God. The two ideas probably are not sharply divided in the writer's mind. They are brought together again, both as definite acts of the past, in 1 Cor. vi. 11, **ἀλλὰ ἀπελούσασθε, ἀλλὰ ἡγιάσθητε, ἀλλὰ ἐδικαιώθητε.** But the effect on *standing* appears to be the thing immediately in view here. In classical Greek, too, the term **καθαρμός** is used in the sense of a purification from *guilt* (*e.g.*, Soph., *O. T.*, 1228). The participle is taken by many as, in relation to **ἁγιάσῃ,** a proper past = "that he might sanctify it *after* cleansing it" (Mey., Alf., Ell.; RV "having cleansed it," etc.). The purification in view is thus made something *prior* to the sanctifying. But **καθαρίσας,** as is often the case with aor. participles connected with a fin. aorist (Bernh., *Synt.*, x. 9, p. 383), may also be of the *same* time as **ἁγιάσῃ** and express the *way* in which the sanctifying takes effect. The latter is the more probable view here (Syr., Vulg., Harl., Abb., etc.), especially as the aor. **ἁγιάσῃ** points to a single, definite act, and one predicated of the *Church* as a whole.—**τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος**: *by the bath of the water.* Designation of the *means* by which the purification takes place. The phrase is a difficult one. The word **λουτρόν** occurs only once again in the NT (Tit. iii. 5). It is used in both cases with reference to *baptism* (although some do not admit this), and it is so used in eccles. Greek. In classical Greek it has the occasional, secondary sense of a *libation* for the dead (Soph., *El.*, 84, 434; Eurip., *Phoen.*, 1667), but is used properly as = "*bath, bathing-place* (*e.g.*, Homer's **θερμὰ λοετρά,** *Il.*, xiv., 6; **λοετρὰ Ὠκεανοῖο,** *Il.*, xviii., 489, etc.); *bathing* (Herod., vi., 52; Xen., *Cyr.*, vii., 5, 20); or the *water for bathing* or *washing* (Soph., *Oed. Col.*, 1599)". It is doubtful whether any clear instance can be found of its use as = *washing.* The **ὕδατος** is prob. the *gen. materiæ*, and the articles mark the **λουτρόν** as the well-known bath of the (baptismal) water. The Versions vary in their renderings. The Vulg. gives *lavacrum*, and similarly the Syr. and the Goth. The Rhem. follows the Vulg. and renders *laver.* But the other old English Versions have either "the *washing*" or "the *fountain*" of water. The RV gives "the washing of water" in the text, but "the laver" in the margin. But "laver," in the sense of the *vessel*, does not appear to be a legitimate translation. The only legitimate rendering is "the *bath* of water," *i.e.*, *the bath of the baptismal water.* Many interpreters find in the phrase an allusion to the bath taken by a bride before her wedding. The subsequent imagery, and especially the **παραστῆσαι,** may favour that; but the fact that the Subject here who cleanses by the bath of the water is Christ, while it was not the *bridegroom* who administered the pre-nuptial bath to the bride, makes that doubtful.—**ἐν ῥήματι**: *with* (or *through*) *the word.* In respect both of *sense* and of *connection* this is a peculiarly difficult phrase. With respect to the latter the **ἐν ῥήματι** is connected by some with the **ἁγιάσῃ** = "sanctify it by the word," **ἐν** being taken as the *instrum. dat.* (Winer, Rück., Bisp., Bleek, Mey., etc.; *cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 172). The objection to this is the remoteness of the defining phrase from the verb. On the other hand it may be the case that the order is selected with a view to bringing things together, first the two verbs and then the two defining terms (so Meyer). The analogy of John xvii. 17, **ἁγίασον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ,** is also urged. Others connect it with the **λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος,** = "the bath of water *in* or *by* the word". But to this there is the serious objection that the **ἐν ῥήματι** is anarthrous. The Greek would require either **τῷ** or **τοῦ ἐν ῥήματι,** the phrase not being one of the kind (like **τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασι,** chap. ii. 15 above) to make a single idea with the **λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος** and so dispense with the article; *cf.* on chap. i., 17 above. There remains the third course—to connect it with **καθαρίσας,** or with the idea expressed by the clause **καθαρίσας τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος** as a whole. This on the whole is the connection freest from difficulty, and it gives a congruous idea, which may take more than one form, *e.g.*, that the purification is *effected by* the **ῥῆμα**; that it is *accompanied* by it; or that it takes place *in* it as its *element* or *condition.* But what of the *sense* of the **ῥήματι**? How difficult it is to obtain a satisfactory meaning appears at once from the variety and the peculiarity of the interpretations proposed. Some, *e.g.*, take it to refer to the baptismal *formula*, "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," or "in the name of Jesus" (Chrys.); in which case, however, we should expect either **καὶ ῥήματος** or **ἐν τῷ ῥήματι.** Others give the noun the simple sense of "an *utterance*" and take the phrase to mean "*attended* or *conditioned* by an utterance"; with the explanation that the particular *utterance* in view is "the revelation of salvation embodied in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy

ἁγιάσῃ καθαρίσας τῷ [d]λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος [e]ἐν ῥήματι, 27. ἵνα [c]παραστήσῃ αὐτὸς[1] ἑαυτῷ [g]ἔνδοξον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μὴ ἔχουσαν

c = John xvii. 17, 19; Rom. xv. 16 al. Paul; Jude 1; Rev. xxii. 11. d Tit. iii. 5 only; Cant. iv. 2. e Ch. iv. 19, vi. 2; δ. (without art.), Rom. x. 17; Heb. vi. 5, xi. 3; ch. vi. 17; Paul only. f = 2 Cor. xi. 2; Luke ii. 22; Acts i. 3, ix. 41, xxiii. 33; Rom. vi. 13 al.; Luke and Paul only (see Matt. xxvi. 53). g Luke vii. 25, xiii. 17; 1 Cor. iv. 10 only; 1 Kings ix. 6 al.

[1] ιν. π. αυτην D^3EK, etc., Vss., Chr., Thdrt.$_1$, al.; αυτος ℵABD*FGLP 6, 10, 17, 23^1, 67^2, etc., It., Vulg., Copt., Goth., Greek-Lat. Fathers.

Ghost" (Moule). Haupt, again, makes it = "by means of a word," supposing the term to be added in order to bring out the wonderfulness of the purification as seen in the fact that it is effected simply by a *word*, that is to say the word spoken by the person who baptises. Hofmann also gives it the sense of "with a word," *i.e.* = cleansing it *by the utterance of His effective will*. Others make it = "by the bath resting on a word," *viz.*, the Divine *command* (Storr, Kl., etc.). If we look, however, at the use of the word **ῥῆμα** in the NT we find that it is applied to anything spoken—a *sound* produced by the voice (2 Cor. xii. 4; Heb. xii. 19); a *declaration* (Matt. xxvi. 75; Mark ix. 32, Luke ii. 50, etc.); *doctrine* or *instruction* (Rom. x. 17, if not = *command*); or a *saying*, whether in the form of a *message* (Rom. x. 8), a *command* (Luke v. 5), or a *promise* (Luke i. 38, ii. 29). In Paul's Epistles and in Hebrews, it appears to be used mostly, if not exclusively, of a word proceeding directly or indirectly from *God* (*cf.* Ell. *in loc.*). It has indeed another sense, that of "thing," corresponding to the Hebr. דָּבָר, "the thing spoken of," "the thing enjoined," etc. (*e.g.*, Matt. xviii. 16; Luke i. 37, ii. 15; Acts x. 37; 2 Cor. xiii. 1). This sense is claimed for it by some in Rom. i. 8, 13-21. But it is scarcely applicable here. Hence here it may best be taken to refer either to the *word of promise*, that is the Divine promise of forgiveness (Mark xvi. 16), or to the *preached Gospel*. It has also the great advantage of being in harmony with the **ῥῆμα Θεοῦ** in chap. vi. 17. It is true that **ῥῆμα** is not quite the same as **λόγος**, but carries with it the definite sense of the *spoken* word; and that, consequently, it may not be taken to designate the *Gospel* here in the subjective sense of *divine truth*, the Word of God in respect of its spiritual contents, or as a revelation of grace. But it may have the sense of that truth as *proclaimed*, the *preached* Word or Gospel. With the former sense the clause will define the purification as being *in accordance with* or *dependent on* the Divine promise, or having that promise as its *ground*. The latter interpretation (which is preferred by Meyer, etc.) is thought to be most in harmony with Rom. x. 8, 17; Eph. vi. 17; Heb. vi. 5, and it gives a good sense however the **ἐν** is construed. The main objection urged against these two interpretations is the absence of the article, and the fact that where **ῥῆμα** has such a sense it is accompanied by some defining term, **Θεοῦ** (Eph. vi. 17), **Χριστοῦ** (Rom. x. 17) or the like. To this the only reply is that the omission of the article is due to the presence of the preposition (Middleton, *Gr. Artic.*, vi. 1; *cf.* Ell. *in loc.*), or that **ῥῆμα** may have become, like **νόμος, χάρις**, etc., so well-understood and constant a term in the sense of "the spoken word" *par excellence*, that it could dispense with the article (Mey.). Thus the import of the whole verse will be—"that he might set apart and consecrate the Church by cleansing it of guilt by baptism in accordance with the Divine promise" (or, "on the ground of the preached word of the Gospel"). The clause defines the **καθαρισμός** as one that does not take effect by means of the **λουτρὸν τοῦ ὕδατος** in and by itself, but by that only as administered in the *power* or on the *ground* of the preached Word. It is to be observed also that the *sanctifying* and the *purifying* are referred to Christ's giving up of Himself, His death being that in virtue of which these things take place.

Ver. 27. **ἵνα παραστήσῃ αὐτὴν [αὐτὸς] ἑαυτῷ ἔνδοξον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν**: *that He might Himself present to Himself the Church, glorious*. Statement of the remote, ultimate object with which Christ "gave Himself up" to death; as the *immediate* object, which has that final purpose in view, is expressed by the **ἁγιάσῃ**. For **αὐτήν** of the TR, supported by D^3K, most cursives, Syr.-P., etc., the reading **αὐτός** is to be substituted on the authority of BℵAD*GL, Syr.-Harc., Vulg., etc. It is Christ *Himself* who is to present the Church, and it is to *Himself* He is to present it. He is at once the Agent and the End or Object of the presentation. The

h 2 Pet. ii. 13 only; Jos., *Anti.*, xiii., 11, 3. i Here only; Aristoph., *Plut.*, 1051; Plat., *Symp.*, p. 191 A. k Rom. i. 32 al. Paul; 3 John 8. l Ch. i. 4 reff. m=Luke xvii. 10; John xiii. 14 al.; 1 Cor. xi. 10 al.

h σπίλον ἢ i ῥυτίδα ἤ τι k τῶν τοιούτων, ἀλλ' ἵνα ᾖ ἁγία καὶ l ἄμωμος 28. οὕτως m ὀφείλουσιν οἱ ἄνδρες l ἀγαπᾶν τὰς ἑαυτῶν γυναῖκας ὡς τὰ ἑαυτῶν σώματα. ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἑαυτὸν ἀγαπᾷ·

[1] **και οι ανδρες οφειλουσιν** ABDEFG 17, 213, It., Vulg., Syr., Copt., Clem., Jer., Aug., Pel.; **κ. οφ. οι ανδρ.** Arm.; **ουτως οφειλουσιν οι ανδρες** ℵKL, etc., Syr., Method., Chr., Thdrt., al.

παραστήση is not to be taken here to mean the presenting of the Church as an *offering*. It is true that the verb is so used in Rom. xii. 1; but the case is different here, in respect both of the ruling idea of the paragraph and of the introduction of **ἑαυτῷ**. It would be incongruous with Paul's teaching to speak of Christ as presenting an *offering* to Himself. The idea, as the context suggests, is that of the bridegroom *presenting* or *setting forth* the bride; *cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 2. The anarthrous **ἔνδοξον** is a case of tertiary predicate (*cf.* Buttm., *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 473). The rendering, therefore, is not "present a glorious Church," but "present the Church, glorious," *i.e.*, in the aspect, or character of gloriousness. The presentation in view, which is given here as the *final* object of Christ's surrendering of Himself to death, and is exhibited (by use of the aor.) as a single def. act, cannot be anything done in the world that now is (as is supposed by Beng., Harl., Hofm., etc.), but must be referred (with Aug., Jer., Rück., De Wette, Bleek, Mey., Ell., Alf. and most) to the future consummation, the event of the *Parousia*.—**μὴ ἔχουσαν σπῖλον**: *not having spot*. Explanation of what is implied on the negative side in the **ἔνδοξον**. The neg. **μή** is in place, as the clause refers to the purpose in the mind of Christ. The word **σπῖλος**=*spot, moral blemish*, takes the place of the Attic **κηλίς** in later Greek writers (Dionys., Harl., Plut., Lucian, Joseph., etc.). It occurs only once again in the NT (2 Pet. ii. 13). The "ι" being short in composition (**ἄσπῐλος**), WH, Ell., Alf., etc., accentuate it **σπίλος**; Lach., Tisch., Lipsius, Mey., etc., retain **σπῖλος**.—**ἢ ῥυτίδα**: *or wrinkle*. The word **ῥυτίς** occurs only this once in the NT, and is not found in the Apocrypha or in the LXX, but is not infrequent in profane Greek, whether classical (Aristoph., Plato, etc.), or late (Diod., Plut., Lucian, etc.). Attempts have been made (by Aug., Grot., etc.) to establish a distinction between **σπίλον** and **ῥυτίδα** here, but without success.—**ἤ τι τῶν τοιούτων**: *or any such thing*. The article gives this the force of anything belonging to the *class* of such things as deform and defile.—**ἀλλ' ἵνα ᾖ ἁγία καὶ ἄμωμος**: *but that it should be holy and unblamable*. The regular construction would have taken some such form as **ἀλλ' οὖσαν**, etc. It is changed here, perhaps with a view to variety, as if the paragraph had begun with **ἵνα μὴ ἔχῃ**. Such *oratio variata* was common in Greek, and there are numerous examples of it in the NT generally (*e.g.*, Mark xii. 38; John viii. 53; Acts xx. 34, xxii. 17; 1 Pet. ii. 7), and especially in the Pauline writings (Rom. i. 12, iv. 12, xii. 6; 1 Cor. vii. 13, xiv. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 23; Phil. ii. 22). See Jelf, *Greek Gram.*, § 909; Win.-Moult., p. 722; Buttm., *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 241. On **ἄμωμος** see under i. 4 above.

Ver. 28. **οὕτως ὀφείλουσιν [καὶ] οἱ ἄνδρες ἀγαπᾶν τὰς ἑαυτῶν γυναῖκας**: *even so [also] ought husbands to love their own wives*. The reading and the order vary somewhat. The **ὀφείλουσιν** *precedes* **οἱ ἄνδρες** in most manuscripts, ℵ²KL 17, etc.; in others (ADGP, etc.) it *follows* it. Lachm. prefers the latter; TrWHRV the former. The TR, supported by ℵKL, etc., omits **καί**; which is inserted, however, before **οἱ ἄνδρες** by BADFG 17, and most Versions, etc. It is accepted by TrRV, and is bracketed by WH. The **οὕτως** is taken by some (De Wette, etc.) to refer to the following **ὡς**, = "husbands ought to love their wives *just as* they love their own bodies". To this there is no serious grammatical objection; for **οὕτως** does not look always to what precedes, but may refer to what follows (*e.g.*, 1 Cor. iii. 15, **οὕτω δὲ ὡς διὰ πυρός**; also 1 Cor. iv. 1). When this is the case, however, whether in classical Greek or in the NT, there appears to be a certain *emphasis* on the **οὕτως**, and its more familiar reference is to what precedes. Here, too, the **καί** favours the relation to the preceding **καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστός**, etc. The idea, therefore, is that even as Christ loved the Church so too ought husbands to love their wives.—**ὡς τὰ ἑαυτῶν σώ-**

29. οὐδεὶς γάρ ποτε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σάρκα [1] ἐμίσησεν, ἀλλὰ [n] ἐκτρέφει καὶ [o] θάλπει αὐτὴν,[2] καθὼς καὶ ὁ χριστὸς [3] τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. 30. ὅτι μέλη ἐσμὲν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκ τῶν

n Ch. vi. 4 only; 3 Kings xii. 8, 10 al.
o 1 Thess. ii. 7 only; Deut. xxii. 6.

[1] **την εαυτου σαρκα** ℵ[3], Method., Orig., Victorin., etc.; **την σαρκα αυτου** Vulg., Tert., Ambrst., Jer., etc.

[2] **εκτρ. αυ. κ. θ.** DEFG, d, e, f, g, Goth.; some Vss. repeat **αυτην**; Method. om.-altog.

[3] **ο κυριος** D[3]EKL, etc., Ar.-pol., Slav., Oec.; **ο Χριστος** ℵABD*FGP 17, etc., It., Vulg., Syr., Copt., Sah., etc., Greek-Lat. Fathers.

ματα: *as their own bodies*. This is not to be reduced to "like themselves" (Rosenm., etc.); nor does **ὡς** here mean simply "like," as if all that is meant is that the husband's love for his wife is to be *similar* to his love for his own body. The **ὡς** has its *qualitative* force, = "as it were," "as being". *Christ* and *husband* are each *head*, as Paul has already put it, and as the Church is the body in relation to the former, so is the wife in relation to the latter. The husband, the head, therefore, is to love the wife as being his body, even as Christ loved the Church as forming His body. The idea of husband and wife as being *one flesh* is probably also in view. **ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα, ἑαυτὸν ἀγαπᾷ**: *he that loveth his own wife loveth himself*. The relation of *head* and *body* means that the wife is part of the husband's *self*. To love his wife, therefore, in this character as being his body, is to love *himself*. It is a love, consequently, not merely of *duty*, but of *nature*—**κατὰ φύσιν** as well as **κατ' ὀφειλήν** (Ell.).

Ver. 29. **οὐδεὶς γάρ ποτε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σάρκα ἐμίσησεν**: *for no one ever hated his own flesh*. The **γάρ** gives a reason for the preceding statement, looking to the *thought*, however, rather than to the *form* of the statement. The *thought* is the oneness of husband and wife, the position of the wife as part of the husband's self; and the connection is this—"he should love her even as Christ loved the Church, for the wife, I say, is as the body in that natural relationship in which the husband is the head, so that in loving her he loves *himself*; and this is the reason in *nature* why he should love her, for according to this to hate his wife is to hate his own flesh, which is contrary to nature and a thing never seen". **σάρξ** has here its non-ethical sense, practically = **σῶμα** (as in Matt. xix. 5; Mark x. 8; 1 Cor. vi. 16, etc.).—**ἀλλ' ἐκτρέφει καὶ θάλπει αὐτήν**: *but nourisheth and cherisheth it*. The form **ἀλλά** is preferred again by LTTr WHRV. The **ἐκ-** in the comp. **ἐκτρέφει** may point to the careful, continued nourishing from one stage to another, nourishing *up to maturity*. Ell. takes it to express "the evolution and development produced by the **τρέφειν**" (so, too, Mey., etc.). As **θάλπειν** means primarily to *warm*, some give it the literal sense here, supposing it to look to the *covering* and *protection* of the body as **ἐκτρέφει** looks to its *nourishment*—"fovet" spectat *amictum*, says Bengel, ut "nutrit" victum; and so Mey. But the secondary sense seems more appropriate here, especially in view of the following affirmation regarding Christ, and as it is in 1 Thess. ii. 7.—**καθὼς καὶ ὁ Κύριος [Χριστὸς] τὴν ἐκκλησίαν**: *even as the Lord [Christ] also the Church*. For the **Κύριος** of the TR (with D[3]KL, etc.) read with the best critics **Χριστός**, which is given in BℵAD[1]F, 17, and most Versions and Fathers. That is, "even as Christ also *nourisheth and cherisheth* the Church"—a broad statement of Christ's loving care for His Church, into which no reference to the *Lord's Supper* (which is nowhere in view here) as the means by which the *nourishing* is effected can be dragged (as, *e.g.*, by Kahnis, etc.).

Ver. 30. **ὅτι μέλη ἐσμὲν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ**: *for we are members of His body*. The **μέλη**, which is the heart of the statement, has the emphatic position. We are not something apart from Christ, nor do we occupy only an accidental relation to Him. We are veritable parts of that body of which He is head, and this is the reason why He nourishes and cherishes the Church; *cf.* the detailed description in 1 Cor. xii. 12-27.—**ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ**: *being of His flesh and of His bones*. This sentence, which is added by the TR, has considerable documentary testimony—ℵ[3]D GLP, most cursives, such Versions as the Syr. and the Arm., and such Fathers as Iren., Jer., etc. If it is retained, as is

p Here only; see Luke xii. q Matt. xix. 5 from Gen. ii. 24; 1 Thess. iii. 1 al. r Acts v. 36.

p ὀστέων αὐτοῦ.[1] 31. p ἀντὶ p τούτου q καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος πατέρα καὶ μητέρα,[2] καὶ r προσκολληθήσεται[3] πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα[4] αὐτοῦ,

[1] εκ τ. σ. αυτ. κ. εκ τ. οστ. αυτ. om. ℵ*AB 17, 67², Copt., Eth., Euth.; insert ℵ³DEFGLP, also K, but with του σωματος for των οστεων, most others, Vulg., Syr., Arm., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., al., Jer., al.

[2] τον πατερα ℵAD³EKLP, etc., Marc., Orig., Euth., Meth., Chr., etc.; πατερα without τον BD*FG; πατερα without αυτου ℵ*BD*FG 17, 67², 73, 115, Vulg., Syr.-P., Arm., Orig., etc.; insert αυτου ℵ³AD³EKLP, etc., Syr.-Sch., Cop., Eth., Marc., Meth., etc.; την μητερα, with same authorities mostly as for τον πατερα; omit την BD*FG.

[3] κολληθησεται ℵ³D³FG, Marc., Epiph.

[4] τη γυναικι ℵ*AD*FG 17, 37, 116, It., Vulg., Lat. Fathers, Meth., Epiph.; προς την γυναικα ℵ³BD³EKL, most cursives, Orig.₂, Chr., Thdrt.₂, al.

done by Mey., Ell., Reiche, Alf., etc., it will be an explanation of the affirmation that we are μέλη τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, drawn from the thought of our *origin* (ἐκ). We are *members* of Christ's body, as having the source of our spiritual being in Him. This statement of our *spiritual origin* is expressed in terms like those used of the origin of our physical life, the allusion being probably to the record of the formation of Eve in Gen. ii. 23. As the first woman derived her physical being from Adam in the way there recorded, so we Christians draw our spiritual being from Christ. The evidence, however, is decidedly adverse, the clause not appearing in BℵA, 17, 67², Boh., Eth., Method., Euthal., Origen (prob.), etc. The internal evidence may be said to be against it, in so far, *e.g.*, as a new figure is suddenly introduced, the statement is carried beyond the idea of *relationship*, and no clear or congruous meaning can be readily attached to the new terms, *flesh* and *bones*. Nor is it easy in face of evidence so old and so various to suppose that the words were mistakenly omitted by homœoteleuton. The clause, therefore, is deleted from the *text* by LTTrWHRV; Tr., however, giving it a place on the margin.

Ver. 31. ἀντὶ τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος [τὸν] πατέρα [αὐτοῦ] καὶ [τὴν] μητέρα: *for this cause shall a man leave* [*his*] *father and mother*. Lachm. and Tregelles omit τόν and τήν; which are bracketed by WH. The αὐτοῦ is omitted by LTTrWHRV, as not supported by BℵD*G, 17, Vulg., Arm., etc. It is found in ℵ³AD³KLP, Syr.-P., Boh., etc. These words, whether Paul gives them professedly as a *quotation* in a free form, or uses them directly, making them his own (Mey.), are substantially those which in Gen. ii. 24 follow the statement regarding Eve as bone of Adam's bone and flesh of his flesh. ἀντὶ τούτου corresponds to the ἕνεκεν τούτου of Gen. ii. 24; ἀντί, the prep. of *exchange* and *succession*, being used also, like the Hebrew תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר, in the sense of "for that," and occasionally as = "wherefore"; *cf.* ἀνθ' ὧν, Luke xii. 3; *cf.* Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 125; Win.-Moult., p. 456. Thus ἀντὶ τούτου may refer either to the immediately preceding statement regarding our being *members of* Christ's body (so Mey.), or to the leading idea of the previous verses, *viz.*, the husband's duty to love, nourish, and cherish the wife even as Christ loves, nourishes, and cherishes the Church. The former connection leads, as in Meyer's case, to an allegorising interpretation. The latter is to be preferred as in harmony with a simpler and more natural view of what follows. Another turn is given to the phrase, *e.g.*, by Von Soden, who makes it = "instead of this," supposing the point to be that in place of *hating*, as mentioned in ver. 29, the husband ought to love and cleave to his wife. But this is far-fetched. The καταλείψει, especially in view of its application in the OT passage cited or used, must be taken here as the *ethical* future, the future expressing what *should*, *can*, or *must* be, as, *e.g.*, in Matt. vii. 26; Luke xxii. 49; John vi. 68; Rom. x. 14, etc.; *cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 348; Donaldson, *Greek Gram.*, p. 407. Meyer insists on its being a *pure* future, and refers it to what is to take place at the *Parousia*. The verse as used here has been strangely handled by many commentators, who have found secondary, mystical meanings in the words. Not a few of the Fathers (Chrys., Theod., Theophyl., Jerome, etc.) interpreted it of the Incarnation; and later

καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο [s]εἰς σάρκα μίαν. 32. τὸ [t]μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν, ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω [u]εἰς χριστὸν καὶ [u]εἰς[1] τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

s Matt. xix. 5 reff. t = Rom. xi. 25; 1 Cor. xv. 51 al. Paul; Rev. i. 20 al. u = Acts ii. 25; Heb. vii. 14 only.

[1] omit εις BK 4, 51, 72, 73, etc., Iren. (Greek-Lat.), Tert., al.; insert אADEFGLP, al. pler., Vulg., Syr., Orig.$_2$, Meth., Tit., Chr., Thdrt., Hil., etc.

exegetes expounded it as referring in one way or other to Christ's *present* connection with the Church (Grot., Beng., etc.); some understanding Christ's separation from His *nation* (Mich.), or from the *synagogue*, to be indicated by the phrase "leave His Father," and others even explaining it of the *Lord's Supper* (Harl., Olsh.). Alford applies it mystically to "that past, present, and future which constitutes Christ's Union to His Bride, the Church—His leaving the Father's bosom, which is *past*—His gradual preparation of the Union, which is *present*—His full consummation of it, which is *future*". Even Meyer puts a forced, allegorical sense upon it, taking it to be used typically of the perfect union which takes place between Christ and the Church only at His Second Coming, before which time He is not Husband, but Bridegroom. So the **ἄνθρωπος** becomes *Christ*, at the Parousia; the leaving father and mother becomes mystically Christ's leaving His seat at the right hand of God; the two becoming *one flesh* is the descending, returning Christ making one ethical person with the Church, etc. But all this is in the highest degree unnatural. When Paul allegorises he gives intimation of the fact (**ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα**, Gal. iv. 24), and certainly there is no such allegory as this would be anywhere else in the Pauline writings. Its incongruities condemn it. What is to be made, *e.g.*, of the leaving of the *mother*, which Jerome, *e.g.*, is driven to say means the leaving of the heavenly Jerusalem? We take the verse, therefore, in its simple and obvious sense, as referring to the direct and ruling idea of the paragraph, *viz.*, the natural marriage relation and the duty of husbands to wives; and we read it as an enforcement of that duty based upon the natural identity of the wife with the husband, as stated in the narrative of Creation and illustrated in its highest ideal in the Church's relation to Christ. —**καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ δύο ἔσονται εἰς σάρκα μίαν**: *and shall cleave unto his wife, and the two shall become one flesh.* "Cleave to" represents very well the force of the verb **προσκολλάω**, the Sept. representative of דָּבַק, *to glue to, stick to.* For **πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα**, the reading of TR, with Bא^{3}C^{3}DKL, Orig., etc., **τῇ γυναικί** is given in א*AD*G, etc., and is preferred by LTTr, while WH place it in the margin. The **αὐτοῦ** is omitted by T with א^1, etc. For **προσκολληθήσεται** there is also the variant **κολληθήσεται** in א^{3}D^{1}F, etc.

Ver. 32. **τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν**: *this mystery is great.* Not "this is a great mystery," as it is rendered by the AV and Rhem.; nor "this is a great secret," Tynd., Cran., gen. The term **μυστήριον** (on which see under i. 9 above) cannot mean *allegory* or *dark-saying*, but must have its usual sense of something once hidden and now revealed, a secret disclosed. It cannot refer, therefore, as Mey. makes it do, to the quotation from Gen. ii. 24 as a passage with a hidden typical or mystical meaning, one *deep* (**μέγα**) and difficult to reach. Nor can it well refer to the spiritual union of Christ and the Church by itself (Beng.), or to the comparison between the union of husband and wife and that of Christ and the Church (Est.), as the **ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω** would then lose its point. It is simplest to take it as referring to Christian truth touching the relation between husband and wife as set forth in these verses. That truth is described by **μέγα** as *great*, *i.e.*, in the sense of grandeur and importance. The Vulg. rendering *sacramentum* (followed by Wicl. and the Rhem.) has induced many Roman Catholic theologians to found on this as a passage presenting *marriage* in the character of a *sacrament* — a perverted interpretation which was disavowed indeed by distinguished scholars like Cajetan and Estius in the Roman Catholic Church itself. It may be added that Alford understands by the **μυστήριον** "the matter mystically alluded to in the Apostle's application of the text just quoted; the mystery of the spiritual union of Christ with our humanity, typified by the close conjunction of the marriage state". And Von Soden, taking the **τοῦτο**, as in 1 Cor. xv. 51, to refer to

v=always in Paul; 1 Cor. xi. 11 al.
and in Matt. and Luke (Gosp.), (vi. 24 al.), in Mark (xii. 32), John (viii. 10, but ?), and Acts viii. 1 al., with gen. "except".
x 1 Cor. iii. 15 reff.
w Acts xxi. 19; 1 Cor. xiv. 31; =Mark xiv. 19; John viii. 9.
y Constr., Mark v. 23.

33. [v]πλὴν καὶ ὑμεῖς [w]οἱ καθ' ἕνα ἕκαστος[1] τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα [x]οὕτως ἀγαπάτω [x]ὡς ἑαυτόν,[2] ἡ δὲ γυνὴ [y]ἵνα φοβῆται τὸν ἄνδρα.

[1] εκαστον FG 13, D[1]E. [2] ως εαυ. αγαπ. DEFG (αγαπα D).

what *follows*, supposes the sense to be "this secret, that is, what I am about to say as the secret sense of this sentence, is great". Hatch, again, who regards **μυστήριον** as closely related in sense to **τύπος, σύμβολον** and **παραβολή** and interchangeable with them, gives **μυστήριον** the sense of "symbol" (which he thinks is its meaning also in Rev. i. 20, xvii. 7), and renders it "this symbol (*sc.* of the joining of husband and wife into one flesh) is a great one" (*Essays in Biblical Greek*, p. 61).—**ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω εἰς Χριστόν, καὶ [εἰς] τὴν ἐκκλησίαν**: *but I speak with reference to Christ and the Church.* The second **εἰς** is omitted by LWH, as not found in BK, Iren., Tert., etc.; it is inserted, however, in ℵADFL, Orig., Meth., Theodor., Cypr., Hil., etc. The formula **λέγω δέ** is used in various Pauline passages where an *explanation* of something previously said is in view (*e.g.*, 1 Cor. i. 12; Gal. iii. 17, iv. 1, v. 16; *cf.* **τοῦτο δέ φημι**, 1 Cor. vii. 29, xv. 50). Here too, the sense is not "I *interpret* it," but simply "I *say* it," "I *mean* it". The **δέ** has here its *disjunctive* force, introducing an explanation and separating it from the thing explained (Thayer-Grimm, *Greek-Engl. Lex. of N. T.*, p. 125). The **εἰς** is the prep. of *ethical direction*, indicating that towards which the mind is looking (Thayer-Grimm, *ut sup.*, p. 184; and *cf.* Acts ii. 25),="*with reference* to Christ," not "*of* Christ," far less "*in* Christ" as the Vulg. unhappily renders it. The emphatic position of the **ἐγώ** gives it to be understood that what immediately follows is the writer's own way of putting the matter just stated, or his own application of the words of Scripture. The sense, therefore, is this—"the truth of which I have spoken, the relation of husband and wife as one flesh, is a revelation of profound importance; but let me explain that, in speaking of it as I have done, *my* meaning is to direct your minds to that higher relation between Christ and His Church, in its likeness to which lies its deepest significance.

Ver. 33. **πλὴν καὶ ὑμεῖς οἱ καθ' ἕνα**: *nevertheless ye also severally.* **πλήν**, connected probably with **πλέον** and meaning primarily *further, besides*, is used both for *unfolding* (= moreover); and for *restricting* (=*howbeit, nevertheless*; *cf.* Thayer-Grimm, *ut sup.*, p. 517; Donaldson, *Greek Gram.*, § 548). Here probably it has the latter application,="nevertheless, not to say more of that higher union, see that ye, all of you, fulfil the obligation of love to your wives". The distributive phrase **οἱ καθ' ἕνα**, "ye one by one," individualises the **ὑμεῖς**, and excludes all exceptions. The **καί** conjoins the **ὑμεῖς** with Christ, ="in you also, as in Christ, *love* is to be fulfilled". **ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα οὕτως ἀγαπάτω ὡς ἑαυτόν**: *let each one of you love his own wife as himself.* The sentence, which has begun with the plural **ὑμεῖς**, when it reaches its verb follows the nearest **ἕκαστος**, and gives **ἀγαπάτω** instead of **ἀγαπᾶτε**. The **ἕκαστος** expresses still more emphatically the absoluteness and universality of the Christian duty of conjugal love—a duty from which no single husband is exempt. As in ver. 28 the **ὡς** means not merely that each husband is to love his wife as he loves himself, but that he is to love her as *being* himself, part and parcel of himself according to the Divine idea of the marriage union.—**ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἵνα φοβῆται τὸν ἄνδρα**: *and the wife—let her see that she fear her husband.* **ἡ γυνή** is a *nom. absol.* of a simple kind and emphatic; the **δέ** is metabatic and slightly adversative; ="so much has been said of the husband, and as to the wife now, reverence is her part". The change in the construction from the usual imperative to the form **ἵνα φοβῆται** is explained by some by supplying **βλεπέτω**, as **βλέπετε** stands in v. 15. But **ἵνα** with the conj. is used elsewhere in the NT (Mark v. 23; 2 Cor. viii. 7) as an imperative formula, originally no doubt an elliptical form for "I bid you that you do," or "see you that you do". It occurs also in later Greek prose (*e.g.*, Arrian, *Epict.*, iv., 1, 41), as the corresponding formula **ὅπως** is used in the same way in classical Greek with the fut. indic. (Aristoph., *Nubes*, 823), and more occasionally with the conj. (Xen., *Cyr.*, i., 3, 18). So in Latin, *ibi ut sint omnia*

VI. 1. τὰ τέκνα, [a] ὑπακούετε τοῖς γονεῦσιν ὑμῶν [b] ἐν κυρίῳ[1] · τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν δίκαιον. 2. [c] Τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα,[2]

a Matt. viii. 27 al.
b Ch. iv. 17 reff.
c Exod. xx. 12.

[1] Omit εν κυριω BD*FG, d, e, f, g, Clem., Tert., Cypr.; insert ℵAD²EKLP, all cursives (appy.), most Versions, Orig., Bas., Chr., Euth., Thdrt., Dam., Ambrst., Jer.

[2] After την μ. insert σου FG 37, 47, 115, 219, 238, etc., Syr., Copt., Eth., Orig., etc.

parata, Cic., *Fam.*, xiv., 20 (*cf.* Donaldson, *Greek Gram.*, p. 602; Win.-Moult., p. 396). **φοβῆται**, *fear*, in the sense of *reverence*, spontaneous, obedient regard; *cf.* the frequent application of the verb to the fear of God (Luke i. 50, xviii. 2, 4; Acts x. 2, 22, 35, etc.); and its use in the case of Herod (Mark vi. 20).

CHAPTER VI. Vv. 1-4. Other relative duties—those of parents and children. With this the concise paragraph in Col. iii. 20, 21 is specially to be compared.

Ver. 1. **τὰ τέκνα, ὑπακούετε τοῖς γονεῦσιν [ἐν Κυρίῳ]**: *children obey your parents in the Lord.* The duty of the *wife* has been described by the terms *subjection* or *submission* (**ὑποτάσσεσθαι**) and *fear* (**φοβεῖσθαι**). The duty of the *child* is now described in terms of *obedience* (**ὑπακούειν**, = readiness to hearken to one) and *honour* (**τιμᾶν**, ver. 2). In these words the whole distinctive duty of the child is summed up, in the Old Testament as well as in the New. The "eye that mocketh at his father, and despiseth to obey his mother, the ravens of the valley shall pick it out, and the young eagles shall eat it" (Prov. xxx. 17). Disobedience to parents is named among the dark sins of the heathen of reprobate mind (Rom. i. 30), and the evils of the "grievous times" in "the last days" (2 Tim. iii. 2). The **ἐν Κυρίῳ**, = in *Christ*, is best connected with the **ὑπακούετε**, not with the **γονεῦσιν**. It defines the quality of the obedience by defining the *sphere* within which it is to move—a Christian obedience fulfilled in communion with Christ. This phrase **ἐν Κυρίῳ**, however, is of disputable authority. It is inserted by the TR, supported by ℵAD²·³KLP, Vulg., Syr., etc.; but is omitted by BD* FG, Cyr., Cypr., etc. It is deleted by Lachm., bracketed by TrWH, and retained by RV.—**τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι δίκαιον**: *for this is right.* **δίκαιον** = right, not in the sense of *befitting* (**πρέπον**) merely, but (*cf.* Col. iv. 1; Phil. i. 7, iv. 8; 2 Thess. i. 6) in that of *righteous*, what is required by *law*—the law that is at once founded on the natural relation of **τέκνα** and **γονεῖς** and proclaimed in the Divine Commandment (ver. 2).

Ver. 2. **τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα**: *honour thy father and mother.* Obedience is the *duty*; *honour* is the *disposition* of which the obedience is born. The authoritative terms of the OT Law (Exod. xx. 12; Deut. v. 16), given in the exact words of the LXX, are adopted in order to enforce regard for that disposition.—**ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ**: *which is the first commandment in point of promise.* **ἥτις** may have here a simply *explanatory* force (so Ell., who renders it "the which"; Abb., "for such is") rather than the qualitative sense, or the casual, "seeing it is". But even its *explanatory* use suggests a *reason* for the fulfilment of the commandment. The prep. **ἐν** is understood by some (*e.g.*, Alf.) to be the local **ἐν**, expressing the *sphere* of the commandment, and so conveying the idea of being "accompanied by". But more probably it expresses the simple sense of *relation*, "in regard of," "in point of" (Mey., Ell.; *cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 488). **πρώτη**, like other ordinals, being specific enough in itself, dispenses with the article. But what is meant by this definition of the fifth commandment as the *first* in point of promise? The *second* commandment also has a kind of promise. But if that commandment is discounted because its promise is general, not peculiar to itself, but applicable to all, and if the fifth alone has attached to it a promise relevant to itself, why is it called the "first" and not rather the "only" commandment in point of promise? Some meet the difficulty by supposing it to mean the *first* in the second table (Mich., etc.). But in the second table it would still be not only the *first* but the *only* one of the kind; and if the Jewish division of the Decalogue, which assigned *five* commandments to each of the two tables, reaches thus far back, it would not be even in the second table. Nor can **πρώτη** be taken in the sense of first in *importance*; for it is never described as such (*cf. per contra* Matt. xxii. 38; Rom. xiii. 9, 10; Gal. v. 14). The most probable explanation is that Paul has not the Decalogue alone in view, but the whole series of Divine Command-

d = ch. v. 26 reff.
e f Here only.
g Rom. x. 19 only, from Deut.

ἥτις ἐστὶν[1] ἐντολὴ πρώτη [d] ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ,[2] 3. ἵνα [e] εὖ σοι [e] γένηται καὶ ἔσῃ [f] μακροχρόνιος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. 4. καὶ οἱ πατέρες, μὴ [g] παροργίζετε τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν, ἀλλ' [h] ἐκτρέφετε αὐτὰ ἐν [i] παιδείᾳ καὶ [k] νουθεσίᾳ κυρίου.[3]

xxxii. 21; see Col. iii. 21; ch. iv. 26. h Ch. v. 29 reff.; Prov. xxiii. 24. i 2 Tim. iii. 16; Heb. xii. 5, 7, 8, 11 only; Prov. i. 2, 7 (Ps. vi. 1; Isa. liii. 5). k 1 Cor. x. 11; Tit. iii. 10 only; Wisd., xvi. 6.

[1] Omit εστιν B 46, Eth.

[2] Before επαγγ. insert τη DEFG 2, 73, 115, many Fathers.

[3] For κυρ., Χριστου 17.

ments, Mosaic and later (Mey., etc.). Westcott and Hort notice another possible pointing, *viz.*, **πρώτη, ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ,** = "the which is the first commandment, with the promise that," etc. But this still leaves it unexplained why this commandment is called the *first*. The whole sentence is dealt with as a parenthesis by the RV. But this is to miss the real point of the statement, which is to advance from the duty of *obedience* (**ὑπακούετε**) enforced by its relation to the requirement of law (the **δίκαιον**), to the higher idea of filial *honour* as inculcated in the highest summary of Divine Law, the Decalogue. The **ἥτις** clause, therefore, is an integral part of the statement, and instead of being a remark by the way conveys an advance in the thought.

Ver. 3. **ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται καὶ ἔσῃ μακροχρόνιος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς**: *that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the land*. The quotation of the commandment is continued according to the LXX, but with some variations, *viz.*, **ἔσῃ** for **γένῃ**, and the omission of **τῆς ἀγαθῆς ἧς** (Exod. xx. 12, or **ἧς** alone as in Deut. v. 16) **Κύριος ὁ Θεός σου δίδωσί σοι.** This clause is omitted perhaps as less suitable to those addressed (Abb.); or it may be with a view to generalise the statement and relieve it of all restrictions but those which necessarily condition the promises of temporal blessings (Ell.). Meyer strangely supposes that the quotation is left unfinished simply because the readers could easily complete it for themselves. In that case it might have been even shorter. The first clause promises temporal good generally; the second the particular blessing, so associated in the OT with the idea of the Divine favour, of length of days. The **ἔσῃ** is explained by not a few (Erasm., De Wette, Win., etc.; *cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 361) as a case of *oratio variata*, a transition from the **ἵνα** construction to direct narrative, = "and thou shalt be," as the RV *margin* puts it. But there is no necessity for supposing such a change in the construction, as **ἵνα** with the fut. indic., though strange to Attic Greek (which yet uses **ὅπως** with that tense and mood), is found in the NT (1 Cor. ix. 18; Rev. xxii. 14). In Attic Greek the idea would have been expressed not by **εὖ γενέσθαι**, but by **εὖ πάσχειν, εὖ πράττειν** or similar form (Mey.). In the OT original, **ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς** refers of course to the land of *Canaan*. Meyer thinks it must retain its historical sense here. But that, in its literal completeness, would be something inapplicable to Paul's Christian readers. The fact that the quotation is broken off at this point, and that the more restricted, national terms of the OT promise are omitted, might warrant us in giving the phrase the larger sense of "on the earth" (with RV text). But it is best to take the phrase as far as possible in its historical sense, and translate it "on the land" (RV marg.), *i.e.*, the land on which your Christian lot is cast.

Ver. 4. **καὶ οἱ πατέρες, μὴ παροργίζετε τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν**: *and, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath*. The **καί** continues the statement of this second of the relative or domestic duties, presenting now the other side. The duty is one not only of children to parents, but also of parents to children. The parental duty is set forth in terms of the *father's* obligation without particular mention of the mother's, not because children of maturer age are in view (Olsh.), but simply because the father is the ruler in the house, as the husband is the head of the wife; the mother's rule and responsibility being subordinate to his and represented by his. The parental duty is given first *negatively*, as avoidance of all calculated to *irritate* or *exasperate* the children —injustice, severity and the like, so as to make them indisposed to filial obedience and honour. **παροργίζειν**, a strong verb, found again in Rom. x. 19, with which

5. Οἱ δοῦλοι, ὑπακούετε τοῖς κυρίοις[1] [l]κατὰ σάρκα [m]μετὰ [n]φόβου καὶ [n]τρόμου, ἐν [o]ἁπλότητι τῆς καρδίας[2] ὑμῶν, ὡς τῷ

l (Acts ii. 30); Rom. i. 3, iv. 1, ix. 3 al.; Paul only; = σαρκί or ἐν σ., 1 Pet. iii. 18 al. m = ch. iv. 2 reff. n 1 Cor. ii. 3; 2 Cor. vii. 15; Phil. ii. 12 only. o Col. iii. 22 al. Paul only; 1 Chron. xxix. 17.

[1] τοις κυριοις κατα σαρκα DEFGKL, al. pler., Chr., Thdrt., Oec., etc.; τοις κατ. σαρ. κυρ. ℵABP 17, 31, 37, 39, 47, 57, 73, al.$_8$, Clem., Chr.$_1$, Dam., Thl.

[2] της καρδιας ABDEFGKL, etc., Clem., Chr., Thdrt., Dam.; omit της ℵ 3, 48, 67*, 72, 114, 115, 122, Orig., Bas., etc.

cf. μὴ ἐρεθίζετε in Col. iii. 21.—ἀλλ' ἐκτρέφετε αὐτὰ ἐν παιδείᾳ καὶ νουθεσίᾳ Κυρίου: *but nurture them in the discipline and admonition of the Lord.* For ἀλλ' TTrWHRV prefer ἀλλά as before. We have now the statement of parental duty on the positive side. ἐκτρέφειν has here obviously the sense of *bringing up* (*cf.* Prov. xxiii. 24), not that of *nourishing* as in v. 29 above. ἐν is not *instrumental* here but *local*, denoting the ethical *sphere* or *element* in which the παιδεία and the νουθεσία take place. παιδεία in classical Greek means *education*, the whole *instruction* and *training* of youth, including the training of the *body*. In the NT as also in the OT and the Apocrypha παιδεία and its verb παιδεύειν mean education *per molestias* (Aug., *Enarr.*, in Ps. cxix. 66), *discipline*, instruction by *correction* or *chastening* (Luke xxiii. 16; Heb. xii. 5, 7, 8; Rev. iii. 9; *cf.* Lev. xxvi. 18; Ps. vi. 1; Isa. liii. 5; Ecclus. iv. 17, xxii. 6; 2 Macc. vi. 12). Of the general Greek sense there is but one instance in the case of the *verb* in the NT (Acts vii. 22); and as regards the *noun* the passage in 2 Tim. iii. 16 suits the idea of *disciplinary* instruction. There is no reason, therefore, for departing from the usual biblical sense of the word here, or for giving it the wide sense of *all* that makes the education of children. The term νουθεσία, not entirely strange to classical Greek (*e.g.*, Aristoph., *Ranae*, 1009), but current rather in later Greek (Philo, Joseph., etc.) in place of the earlier form νουθέτησις (νουθετία also appearing to occur occasionally), means *admonition*, training by *word*, and in actual use, mostly, though not necessarily, by word of reproof, remonstrance or blame (*cf.* Trench, *NT Syn.*, pp. 104-108). The Vulg. translates very well, "in disciplina et correptione". The distinction, therefore, between the two terms is not that between the *general* and the *special* (Mey.), but rather that between training by *act and discipline* and training by *word* (Ell.). The Κυρίου is taken by some as the *gen. obj.*, = "about Christ" (so the Greek commentators generally); by others as = "according to the doctrine of Christ" (Erasm., Est., etc.), or as = "worthy of the Lord" (Matthies). But it is best understood either as the *possess. gen.* or as the *gen. of origin*, = "the Lord's discipline and admonition," *i.e.*, *Christian* training, the training that is of Christ, proceeding from Him and prescribed by Him.

Vv. 5-9. Other relative duties—those of masters and servants. With this compare the paragraph in the sister Epistle, Col. iii. 22-iv. 1, and the statement in 1 Peter ii. 18-25.

Ver. 5. οἱ δοῦλοι, ὑπακούετε τοῖς κυρίοις κατὰ σάρκα: *servants obey them who according to the flesh are your masters.* As in the case of the two relations already dealt with, so here the statement begins with the dependent member, the *servant*, who in these times was a *bond-servant*. Many questions would inevitably arise with regard to the duties of masters and servants in a state of society in which slavery prevailed and had the sanction of ancient and undisputed use. Especially would this be the case when Christian slaves (of whom there were many) had a heathen master, and when the Christian master had heathen slaves. Hence the considerable place given in the NT to this relation and the application of Christian principles to it (*cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 21, 22; 1 Tim. vi. 1, 2; Tit. ii. 9, 10; and Philemon, in addition to Col. iii. 22, iv. 1 and 1 Pet. ii. 18-25). Here, as elsewhere in the NT, slavery is accepted as an existing institution, which is neither formally condemned nor formally approved. There is nothing to prompt revolutionary action, or to encourage repudiation of the position. Onesimus, the Christian convert, is sent back by Paul to his master, and the institution is left to be undermined and removed by the gradual operation of the great Christian principles of the equality of men in the sight of God, a common Christian brotherhood, the spiritual freedom of the Christian man, and the Lordship of Christ to which every

p Col. iii. 22 only. **χριστῷ**,[1] 6. **μὴ κατ'** p **ὀφθαλμοδουλείαν**[2] **ὡς** q **ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι, ἀλλ'**
q Col. iii. 22 only; Ps. lii. 5. **ὡς δοῦλοι χριστοῦ**,[3] **ποιοῦντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ**, 7. **ἐκ** r **ψυχῆς**
r Col. iii. 23 only.

[1] For **Χριστω, κυριω** AL 17, 39, 47, Vulg.-ms., Copt., Chr.$_1$.

[2] **οφθαλμοδουλιαν** ℵDEFGLP 37, 120, 121, etc.; **ὀφθαλμοδουλειαν** ABK and most.

[3] **του Χρ.** D^3EKL, etc., Chr., Thdrt.; om. **του** ℵABDFGP, al. plu., Bas., Euth., etc.

other lordship is subordinate. See especially Goldwin Smith's *Does the Bible Sanction American Slavery?*; Köstlin's *Christliche Ethik*, pp. 318, 480, etc.; Mangold's *Humanität und Christenthum*; Lightfoot's *Colossians and Philemon*, pp. 319-329. **ὑπακούετε**, as in the case of children so in that of slaves *obedience* is the comprehensive name for duty, and this as a duty lying within the larger principle of the recognition and honour due to constituted authority (Rom. xiii. 1-7; 1 Pet. ii. 13-17). For **τοῖς κυρίοις κατὰ σάρκα** (TR, with DFKL, etc.), the better order is **τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις** (LTTr WHRV, with BℵAP, etc.), = "those who according to the flesh are your masters" (RV), not "your masters according to the flesh" (AV). In the Pastoral Epistles and 1 Peter the slave's master is called **δεσπότης**. The word **κύριος**, limited by the **κατὰ σάρκα** to the designation of a lordship which holds only for material interests and earthly relations, may perhaps have been selected here with a view to the contrast with the **Κύριος** whose lordship is absolute, inclusive alike of master and of slave, of earthly and of heavenly relations.—**μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου**: *with fear and trembling*. The use of the same phrase with regard to Paul himself (1 Cor. ii. 3), the Corinthians (2 Cor. vii. 15), and the Philippians (Phil. ii. 12), is enough to show that nothing more is in view here than *solicitous zeal* in the discharge of duty, anxious care not to come short.—**ἐν ἁπλότητι τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν**: *in singleness of your heart*. A clause qualifying the *obedience* itself; not the "fear and trembling," in which case we should have expected **τοῦ ἐν ἁπλότητι**, etc. It states the spirit in which the obedience was to be rendered,—not in formality, pretence, or hypocrisy, but in inward reality and sincerity, and with an undivided heart. The noun **ἁπλότης** = the condition of being *without folds*, *simplicity*, as contrasted with *pretence*, *dissimulation*, *insincerity*, in the NT is found only in the Pauline writings, and there seven times, with slightly different shades of meaning (Rom. xii. 8; 2 Cor. viii. 2, ix. 11, 13, xi. 3; Eph. vi. 5; Col. iii, 22; in 2 Cor. i. 12 the preferable reading is **ἐν ἁγιότητι**). The phrase **ἐν ἁπλότητι** occurs again in the first and the last of these passages.—**ὡς τῷ Χριστῷ**: *as to Christ*. That is, with an obedience regarded as rendered to Christ Himself; *cf.* **ὡς τῷ Κυρίῳ** in v. 22, and see also Rom. xiv. 7-9.

Ver. 6. **μὴ κατ' ὀφθαλμοδουλείαν**: *not in the way of eye-service*. TWH prefer the form **ὀφθαλμοδουλίαν**. Negative explanation of what **ἁπλότης τῆς καρδίας** means. **κατά** points to the *principle* or *rule* of action. The noun occurs only here and in Col. iii. 22; but **ὀφθαλμόδουλος** is found also in the *Constit. Apost.*, iv. 12. It is the service that is done only when one is under the master's eye—an obedience to save appearances and gain undeserved favour, which is not rendered when the master is absent as it is when his scrutiny is on us.—**ὡς ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι**: *as men-pleasers*. **ἀνθρωπάρεσκος** is another non-classical word, occurring only in biblical and ecclesiastical Greek, and in the NT limited to this passage and Col. iii. 22; *cf.* Ps. liii. 6, **ὀστᾶ ἀνθρωπαρέσκων** in LXX, and *Ps. Salom.*, iv., 8, 10.—**ἀλλ' ὡς δοῦλοι [τοῦ] Χριστοῦ**: *but as bond-servants of Christ*. **τοῦ** is found in D^3KL, etc., but not in BℵAD*F, etc., and is omitted by LTTrWH. The contrast is with **ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι**, servants of *Christ*, not pleasers of *men*. The **δοῦλοι Χριστοῦ**, therefore, is a clause by itself, only *explained* by what follows. Some, mistaking this, make it one sentence with **ποιοῦντες**, etc.; in which case it loses its force, and the emphasis is on the **ποιοῦντες**.—**ποιοῦντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκ ψυχῆς**: *doing the will of God from the heart*. Statement of what is appropriate to the "bond-servants of Christ". It belongs to the *character* (**ὡς**) of the bond-servant of Christ to do the will of God, the God and Father of Christ, in his condition in life, and to do that not grudgingly or formally, but *ex animo*, with hearty readiness—**ἐκ ψυχῆς**, lit.

μετ' [s] εὐνοίας δουλεύοντες ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ[1] καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώποις[2]· 8. εἰδότες ὅτι ὃ ἐάν τι ἕκαστος[3] ποιήσῃ ἀγαθὸν, τοῦτο [t] κομίσεται[4]

s 1 Cor. vii. 3 only; 1 Macc. xi. 53.
t = 2 Cor. v. 10; Col. iii. 25 al

[1] Omit ως before τω κυριω D³EKL, al. plu., Thdrt., Dam., etc.; insert ως ℵAB D*FGP, d, e, f, g, m, Vulg., Syr., Bas., Chr., etc.

[2] ανθρωπω B, Eth., Dam.

[3] εκαστος *after* οτι ABDEFGP, etc., d, e, f, g, m, Vulg., Copt., Arm., Petr., Bas., Euth., Dam., etc.; εκαστος *before* ποιηση KL, al. longe plu., Syr., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., Theophyl., Oec.; εκαστος *after* ποιηση ℵ*,³, Syr.-P.; εαν τι ποιηση BL, d, e, 46, 62, 115, 129, Petr., etc.; ειδοτες οτι (prob. ο τι) εαν ποιηση ℵ*; ο εαν ποιηση ℵ³ADEFGP 3, 17, 31, etc.; ο εαν τι εκαστος ποιηση L**, al. plu., Chr.¹⁸⁰, Thdrt., Dam.

[4] κομισεται ℵ*ABD*FGP (-ισηται), Petr.; κομιειται ℵ³D³EKL, Bas., Euth., Thdrt., Dam.

"from the soul," *cf.* ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου "with all thy soul," Mark xii. 30. The ἐκ ψυχῆς is attached by not a few (Syr., Chrys., Jer., Beng., Harl., De Wette, Alf., Abb., WH) to the following clause. Tregelles, again, would attach both ἐκ ψυχῆς and μετ' εὐνοίας to the ποιοῦντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ. But on the whole the simplest and most congruous connection is as it is given both in the AV and the RV. The addition of ἐκ ψυχῆς to the ποιοῦντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ is not superfluous; for to be true to the character of the bond-servant of Christ requires not merely the doing of God's will, but the doing of that will *ex animo*. But such definition is enough, and there is no need of the further description μετ' εὐνοίας. On the other hand the μετ' εὐνοίας is as pertinent as an explanation of the δουλεύοντες as ἐκ ψυχῆς is as an explanation of the ποιοῦντες.

Ver. 7. μετ' εὐνοίας δουλεύοντες [ὡς] τῷ Κυρίῳ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώποις: *with good will doing service [as] to the Lord and not to men.* Further explanation of what is meant by the bond-service of Christ, *viz.*, a service rendered with *good will* and as a service to the Lord Himself, not to men. μετ' εὐνοίας means not simply *with readiness*, but with the disposition that wishes one well. In the NT the noun occurs only here; in 1 Cor. vii. 3 the accredited reading is not εὐνοίαν but ὀφειλήν. The TR omits ὡς before τῷ Κυρίῳ (with D³KL, etc.). It is given, however, by BℵAD* GP, Vulg., Syr., etc., and is rightly inserted by LTTrWHRV. It got a place in Beza's edition of 1598.

Ver. 8. εἰδότες ὅτι ὃ ἐάν τι ἕκαστος ποιήσῃ ἀγαθόν: *knowing that whatsoever good thing each shall have done.* Or, according to the text of T and WH = "knowing that each, if he shall have done any good thing". Participal clause subjoining a reason or encouragement for a service rendered in sincerity, with hearty good-will, and as to the Lord Himself. The encouragement lies in their Christian knowledge of the Lord's reward. εἰδότες, not = "who know" as if οἱ εἰδότες, but "seeing ye know," "knowing as ye do". The ποιήσῃ, as followed by the κομίσεται, is best rendered "shall have done". The readings vary greatly. Passing over minor diversities, *e.g.*, εἰδόντες for εἰδότες, ἐάν τις ἕκαστος, ὃ ἕκαστος ποιήσῃ with omission of ἐάν τι, etc., we find exceptional uncertainty in the text of the ἐὰν clause. The TR reads ὅτι ὃ ἐάν τι ἕκαστος, which is given in L² and most cursives. In that case ἐὰν is the *potential* ἄν, the ὅ and the τι being separated by *tmesis* (*cf.* ἣν ἄν τινα καταβλάψῃ, Plato, *Laws*, ix., 864 E), and the sense being = "whatsoever each," etc. But in a considerable number of Manuscripts and Versions (ADGP, 17, 37, Vulg., Arm., etc.) we find ὅτι ἕκαστος ὃ ἂν (or ἐὰν) ποιήσῃ,; in ℵ*, ὅτι (probably ὅ τι) ἐὰν ποιήσῃ, while ℵ³ inserts ὅ before ἐάν; in L*, and one or two cursives (46, 62, 115, 129), ὅτι ἐάν τι ἕκαστος; and in B d, e, Petr. alex. can. 6, ὅτι ἕκαστος ἐάν τι ποιήσῃ. This last reading is preferred by Tisch., ed. viii.th, Alf., WH, and is placed in the margin by Lach. In this ἐὰν is the *conditional* particle and the sense is = "knowing as ye do that each, if he shall have done any good thing". The Manuscripts constantly vary between ἄν and ἐάν. In classical Greek the conditional ἐάν, *if*, took also the contracted form ἄν, especially in Thucydides and Plato, and this possibly is the explanation of the biblical use of ἐὰν as = the *potential* ἄν. In any case the use of ἐὰν, attached to relative pronouns and adverbs, ὁ ἐάν,

u Acts xvi. 26, xxvii. 40; Heb. xiii. 5 only; Deut. xxxi. 6. v Acts iv. 17, 29, ix. 1 only; Job xxiii. 6

παρὰ κυρίου,[1] εἴτε δοῦλος εἴτε ἐλεύθερος. 9. καὶ οἱ κύριοι, τὰ αὐτὰ ποιεῖτε πρὸς αὐτούς, [u] ἀνιέντες τὴν [v] ἀπειλήν, εἰδότες ὅτι καὶ αὐτῶν

[1] του κυρ., with KL, etc., Fathers; κυριου ℵABDEFGP, Petr., Euth., Dam., etc.

ὅπου ἐάν, οὗ ἐάν, ὁσάκις ἐάν, etc., with the *potential* force, appears to occur (making all due allowance for uncertainties in the texts) with some frequency both in the LXX and in the NT, and it is found in the papyri; *cf.* Thayer-Grimm, *Lex.*, p. 168; Buttm., *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 72; Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, pp. 60, 61, 216.—**τοῦτο κομιεῖται [κομίσεται] παρὰ [τοῦ] Κυρίου**: *this shall he receive again from the Lord.* The **κομιεῖται** of the TR is supported by ℵ[3]D[3] KL, Bas., Chr., Theodor., etc.; P gives **κομίσηται.** The best reading is **κομίσεται,** which is that of Bℵ*AD*G, etc. In the NT the verb **κομίζειν** is used once in the simple sense of *carrying* or *bringing to* one (Luke vii. 37, of the woman's **ἀλάβαστρον**); oftener in the sense of *obtaining* (1 Pet. i. 9; 2 Pet. ii. 13; Heb. x. 36; xi. 39), or in that of *receiving back, recovering one's own* (Matt. xxv. 27; 2 Cor. v. 10; Col. iii. 25). The word has this last sense also in classical Greek (*e.g.*, **τὴν ἀδελφήν,** Eurip., *Iph. T.*, 1362; Thuc., i., 113, etc.). So here the idea is that of receiving *back.* The "good thing" done is represented as being itself given back to the doer; the certainty, equity and adequacy of the reward being thus signified (*cf.* especially 2 Cor. v. 10). Whether the Middle is to be taken as the *appropriative* Middle, expressing as it were the receiving back of a *deposit* (Ell.) is doubtful in view of the fact that in every NT occurrence but one (Luke vii. 37) Middle forms are used. The best uncials omit **τοῦ** before **Κυρίου,** and so LTTrWHRV.—**εἴτε δοῦλος, εἴτε ἐλεύθερος**: *whether bond or free.* The reward in view is that of the Great Day, the Parousia, which will have regard not to *social* distinctions or external circumstances, but only to *spiritual* conditions.

Ver. 9. **καὶ οἱ Κύριοι, τὰ αὐτὰ ποιεῖτε πρὸς αὐτούς**: *and ye masters* [or *lords*, RV marg.], *do the same things unto them.* The **καί** has the same force as in vi. 4 above. The duty of the masters is a corresponding duty, essentially the same as that of the servants (**τὰ αὐτά**), and it is stated first in respect of what is to be done and then in respect of what is to be left undone. It is to put a forced sense, however, on the phrase **ποιεῖτε τὰ αὐτά** if it is made to refer only to the preceding **δουλεύοντες** (Chrys.), as if the point were that the masters had a *service* to render to the **δοῦλοι** as these had a service to render to them. Nor does it seem to look back simply to the more general idea in **ποιοῦντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ.** Probably the **μετ' εὐνοίας** is more immediately in view, and the meaning is that the masters were to act to their servants in the same Christian way as the servants were called to act to them—in the same spirit of consideration and goodwill.—**ἀνιέντες τὴν ἀπειλήν**: *giving up your threatening.* The **τήν,** pointing to the too well-known habit of the masters, may be best rendered by "your". **ἀνίημι** is used in the NT in the sense of *loosening* (Acts xvi. 26, xxvii. 40), and of *leaving* (Heb. xiii. 5, from LXX). In classical Greek it is used metaphorically both of *slackening, releasing* (Aristoph., *Vesp.*, 574), and *giving up* (Thuc., iii., 10, of **ἔχθρα**). The latter sense is most in point here. As Ell. rightly observes: "St. Paul singles out the prevailing vice and most customary exhibition of bad feeling on the part of the master, and in forbidding this, naturally includes every similar form of harshness". This negative side of the master's duty is not noticed in the parallel passage in Col. iv. 1.—**εἰδότες ὅτι καὶ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν [αὐτῶν καὶ ὑμῶν] ὁ Κύριός ἐστιν ἐν οὐρανοῖς**: *knowing as ye do that also your Master [that both their Master and yours] is in heaven.* **εἰδότες,** as in ver. 8, expresses the reason or encouragement for such conduct on the part of masters, *viz.*, the fact that masters themselves have a Master or Lord, whose seat is in *heaven*, not merely on earth, and who is Lord equally of master and of slave. The reading of the TR, **καὶ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν,** has the support of most cursives and such uncials as K. Some few MSS. give **καὶ αὐτῶν ὑμῶν** (D[3]G). But the best accredited reading is **καὶ αὐτῶν καὶ ὑμῶν,** "both theirs and yours," given by B[1]AD*, also by ℵ* (except that **αὐτῶν** becomes **ἑαυτῶν**), Syr., Boh., Vulg., Arm., etc., and accepted by LTTrWHRV.—**καὶ προσωποληψία οὔκ εστι παρ' αὐτῷ**: *and respect of persons is not with Him.* The form **προσωποληψία** is preferred by the best critics (LTTrWH). The noun and

καὶ ὑμῶν[1] ὁ κύριός[2] ἐστιν ἐν οὐρανοῖς[3] καὶ [w]προσωπολημψία[4] οὐκ [x]ἐστιν [x]παρ᾽ αὐτῷ.[5]

10. Τὸ [y]λοιπὸν,[6] [z]ἐνδυναμοῦσθε[7] ἐν κυρίῳ καὶ ἐν τῷ [a]κράτει τῆς

w Rom. ii. 11; Col. iii. 25; James ii. 1 only. y 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Phil. iv. 8; 1 Thess. iv. 1; 2 Thess. iii. 1; =Paul only. z Rom. iv. 20 al.; Paul only, exc. Acts ix. 22. a Ch. i. 19 reff.

[1] και αυτων και υμων ℵ* (εαυτων) ABDP 17, 31, 37, 38, 116, Vulg., Goth., Arm., Copt., Clem., Euth., Dam., Jer.; και υμων και αυτων ℵ³L 5, 23, 47, 67, 73, 115, 213, Syr.-P., Petr., Bas., Cypr., Ambrst.; και αυτων υμων DEFG, g, etc.; και υμων αυτων K, al. plu., d, e, Syr.-Sch., Eth., Bas., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., etc.

[2] Omit ο before κυριος 17, 74, 115, 238, Bas., Dam.

[3] ουρανοις Clem., Petr., Bas., etc.; τοις ουρανοις P; ουρανω ℵ 31, 47, 73, Bas., Dam., etc.

[4] προσωποληψια D³EKLP, etc.; προσωπολημψια ℵAB*D*FG.

[5] παρ αυτω Petr., Bas., etc.; εν αυτω 31, 37, Syr.-P., Cypr., etc.; παρα θεω D*FG, d, e, f, g, m, Pelag., etc. (FG add τω.)

[6] του λοιπου ℵ*AB 17, 73, 118, Euth., Cyr., Procop., Dam.; το λοιπον ℵ*DEFG KLP, etc., Chr., Thdrt., Theophyl., Oec., etc.; add αδελφοι μου ℵ³KLP, etc., Syr., Copt., Goth., Chr., Theophyl., etc.; omit ἀδελφοι μου ℵ*BDE 17, d, e, m, Arm., Eth., Dam., etc.

[7] δυναμουσθε B 17, Orig.

its cognates προσωπολημπτής (Acts x. 34), προσωπολημπτέω (Jas. ii. 9), ἀπροσωπολήμπτως (1 Pet. i. 17), are Hellenistic forms, occurring only in biblical and ecclesiastical Greek. προσωπολημψία itself is found only four times in the NT (Rom. ii. 11; Eph. vi. 9; Col. iii. 25; James ii. 1). *Cf.* also the phrases βλέπειν εἰς πρόσωπον (Matt. xxvi. 16; Mark xii. 14), λαμβάνειν πρόσωπον (Luke xx. 21; Gal. ii. 6), which in the NT have always a bad meaning,—to judge partially, to have regard to the person in judging or treating one. In the LXX the phrase λαμβάνειν or θαυμάζειν πρόσωπον is also used in the sense of having respect to one's person, *being partial* (*e.g.*, Job xxxii. 21, where it is conjoined with *giving flattering titles*), but admits at the same time of the better sense of *showing favour* to one (Gen. xix. 21).

Vv. 10-20. General concluding exhortation, following up the injunctions bearing on the particular, domestic duties. This comprehensive charge, which is expressed in terms of the Christian's spiritual warfare, the powers of evil with which he has to contend, and the weapons with which he is to arm himself, brings the Epistle worthily to its close.

Ver. 10. τὸ λοιπόν [ἀδελφοί] μου, ἐνδυναμοῦσθε [δυναμοῦσθε] ἐν Κυρίῳ: *finally* (or, *henceforth*) [*my brethren*], *be strengthened in the Lord.* For τὸ λοιπόν, the reading of TR with DFKLℵ³, etc., τοῦ λοιποῦ, is to be preferred (with LTTr WHRV) as sustained by Bℵ*A, 17, etc. The form τὸ λοιπόν (also the simple λοιπόν) is used in classical Greek both as = "as for the rest," *quod superest*, "finally" and with the temporal sense of *henceforth.* In the NT it has both these applications (*e.g.*, Phil. iii. 2, iv. 8; 2 Thess. iii. 1, etc., for the former, and Matt. xiv. 41, xxvi. 45; 1 Cor. vii. 29; Heb. x. 13 for the latter). It occurs also once in the sense of "at last," or "already" (Acts xxvii. 20). The form τοῦ λοιποῦ, properly a temporal gen., both in classical Greek (Herod., ii., 2; Xen., *Cyr.*, iv., 4, 10, etc.) and in the NT (Gal. vi. 17), has the sense of "henceforth". τὸ λοιπόν can be used for τοῦ λοιποῦ, but it does not appear that τοῦ λοιποῦ is equally interchangeable with τὸ λοιπόν. Here τὸ λοιπόν might mean either "as for what you have still to do in addition to what has been said" (Mey.), or "henceforth". τοῦ λοιποῦ is="*in* the future," "henceforth" (*cf.* Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, pp. 94, 109; Ell. on Gal. vi. 17; Thayer-Grimm, *Lex.*, p. 382). The TR inserts ἀδελφοί μου, with ℵ³KLP, most cursives, and Syr., Boh., etc. ἀδελφοί, without μου, is read by AFG, Vulg., Theodor., etc. But the best accredited text (Bℵ*D, 17, Eth., Arm., Cyr., Luc.. Jer., etc.) omits the phrase (so LTTrWHRV). The ἐνδυναμοῦσθε of the TR is supported by the mass of authorities, but is displaced by the simple δυναμοῦσθε (which occurs in Col. i. 11) in B 17; which latter is given a place in the margin by WH. ἐνδυναμοῦσθαι is a proper passive = "to

b Ch. iv. 24 [a] **ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ.** 11. [b] **ἐνδύσασθε** [1] **τὴν** [c] **πανοπλίαν τοῦ θεοῦ,** [d] **πρὸς**
reff.
c Luke xi. **τὸ** [2] **δύνασθαι ὑμᾶς στῆναι** [3] **πρὸς τὰς** [e] **μεθοδείας** [4] **τοῦ διαβόλου.**
22 only;
2 Kings ii. 21. d = Matt. v. 28 al. e Ch. iv. 14 reff.

[1] **ενδυσ. υμας** FG. [2] **εις το** DEFG. [3] **στ. υμ.** DE; **αντιστ.** K.
[4] **μεθοδειας** B^3D^3P, etc.; **μεθοδιας** ℵAB*FGKL 37, etc.

be strengthened," as in Acts ix. 22; Rom. iv. 10; 2 Tim. ii. 1; Heb. xi. 34. The **ἐν Κυρίῳ** (**ἐν τῷ Κυρίῳ** in ℵ*) defines the strengthening as *Christian* strengthening, such as can take effect only in union with Christ.—**καὶ ἐν τῷ κράτει τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ**: *and in the power of his might.* On the distinction between the various words for *strength*, etc., *cf.* on chap. i. 19 above. The phrase is not to be reduced to "in his mighty power," but has the full force of "in the active efficacy of the might that is inherent in him". Meyer takes the **ἐν** as instrumental = "by means of the might of his strength". But it has its proper force of "in," the efficient, energetic power of the Lord's inherent might being the principle or element *in* which the increase of strength which is possible only where there is union with Christ is to realise itself. By the **καί**, therefore, this clause *adds* something to the preceding and does more than merely *explain* it. In 2 Cor. xii. 9, **ἵνα ἐπισκηνώσῃ ἐπ' ἐμὲ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Χριστοῦ**, the idea is that of the strength of Christ descending to *rest* on one.

Ver. 11. **ἐνδύσασθε τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ**: *put on the whole armour of God.* Further explanation of what has to be done in order to become strong enough to meet all enemies, even the devil. **τοῦ Θεοῦ** is the gen. of *origin* or *source*, = the panoply which comes from God or is provided by Him. To put the emphasis on the **Θεοῦ** (Harl.) is to miss the point and to suppose a contrast which there is nothing here to suggest, *viz.*, with some *other* kind of panoply. The emphatic thing, as most exegetes notice, is the **πανοπλίαν**, the idea being that we need not only a Divine equipment, but that equipment in its *completeness*, without the lack of any single part. The fact that, in order to meet our spiritual foe, we need to take to ourselves all that God provides for living and for overcoming, is expressed in a telling figure drawn from the world of soldiery. The figure of the Christian as a *warrior* with his *arms*, *wages*, etc. (**ὅπλα, ὄψωνια**, etc.), occurs repeatedly in the Pauline writings (Rom. vi. 13, 23, xiii. 12; 2 Cor. x. 4; 1 Thess. v. 8; 1 Tim. i. 18, vi. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 7). In briefer form the figure of the *armour* appears in 1 Thess. v. 8, and in its rudiments also in Isa. lix. 17; *cf.* also Wisd. v. 17, etc. **πανοπλία** is not *armour* simply (Vulg. *armatura*, Harl., etc.), but *whole armour*, the complete equipment of the Roman **ὁπλίτης** or "man of arms," consisting of shield, helmet, breastplate, greaves, sword and lance; *cf.* Thuc., iii., 14; Isocr., 352 D; Herod., i., 60; Plato, *Laws*, vii., p. 796 B; and especially Polybius, vi., 23, 2, etc. The word occurs only once again in the NT (Luke xi. 22). No doubt the *Roman* soldier is particularly in view. Paul, the Roman citizen, would think of him, and it was the Roman military power that filled the eye where Paul laboured and wrote.—**πρὸς τὸ δύνασθαι ὑμᾶς στῆναι πρὸς τὰς μεθοδείας τοῦ διαβόλου**: *that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil.* Statement of the *object* of the putting on of this panoply. The general sense of *direction* conveyed by the flexible prep. **πρός** when followed by the acc. takes a wide variety of applications. In this short sentence it expresses *mental* direction, *aim* or *object*, and *local* direction, *against*. The phrase **στῆναι πρός** belongs to the soldier's language, being used for *standing one's ground*, in opposition to taking to flight (Thuc., v., 104, and *cf.* Raphel., *Annot.*, ii., p. 493). In Jas. iv. 7 we have **ἀντιστῆναι** with the dat. For **μεθοδείας** TWH prefer **μεθοδίας**. On this rare term, found neither in profane Greek nor in the OT, and in the NT only in the two occurrences in this Epistle, see on chap. iv. 14 above. The plural denotes the various forms which the **μεθοδεία**, the *craftiness*, takes, and is fitly rendered either *stratagems* (which brings out the fundamental idea of *method* or *plan* in the deceit) or *wiles*. The Rhem. gives *deceits*; Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish., *assaults* or *crafty assaults*. The *Devil*, **διάβολος**, is mentioned here as the author and practiser of all subtle, malicious scheming. The malign powers of which he is the prince are noticed next.

Ver. 12. **ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν [ὑμῖν] ἡ πάλη πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σάρκα**: *for our [your] wrestling is not against flesh and blood.* Reason for speaking of the **μεθοδεῖαι τοῦ**

12. ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν[1] ἡ [f]πάλη πρὸς [g]αἷμα καὶ [g]σάρκα, ἀλλὰ [f] Here only.
πρὸς τὰς [h]ἀρχὰς, πρὸς τὰς [h]ἐξουσίας, πρὸς τοὺς [i]κοσμοκράτορας [g] Matt. xvi. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 50; Gal. i. 16; Heb. ii. 14; Sir. xiv. 18. [h] Ch. i. 21 reff. [i] Here only.

[1] For ημ., υμιν BDFG 52, 115-20, al., It., Syr., Ar.-pol., Slav. al., Lucif., Ambrst.; ημιν ℵAD³EKLP, etc., most mss., Vulg., Copt., Syr., al., Thdrt., Clem., Orig., Meth., all Cyp., Hil., Jer., Aug., Ambrst.

διαβόλου as dangers against which the Christian must stand his ground. The ὅτι is explanatory, = "the wiles of the Devil, I say, for it is not mere *men* we have to face". The term πάλη, which occurs only this once in the NT, is used in classical Greek occasionally in the general sense of a *battle* or combat (in the poets, *e.g.*, Aesch., *Cho.*, 866; Eurip., *Heracl.*, 159), but usually in the specific sense of a contest in the form of *wrestling*. If it has its proper sense here, as is most probable, there is a departure for the time being from the figure of the panoply, and a transition to one which brings up different ideas. Has Paul, then, who elsewhere uses the more general figures of the μάχη, the ἀγών, etc., any special object in view in selecting πάλη here? There is nothing to indicate any such special object, unless it be to bring out the *hand to hand* nature of the conflict, "the *personal*, *individualising* nature of the encounter" (Ell.). The ἡ defines the πάλη in view, *viz.*, the physical struggle, as not the *kind* of πάλη with which we are concerned—which is "for us" (ἡμῖν). The ἡμῖν of the TR has the support of ℵAD³KLP, most cursives, and most Versions; ὑμῖν is read by BD*G, Eth., Goth., etc. The case is somewhat evenly balanced. TrWH place ὑμῖν in the margin; Lach., Tisch., etc., keep ἡμῖν. The form αἷμα καὶ σάρξ occurs only here and (acc. to the best critics) in Heb. ii. 14. Elsewhere it is σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα; but the sense is the same, = *feeble humanity*. The phrase occurs four times in the NT, always with the same general sense of man in the character of his *weakness* and *dependence*, but with slightly varying references; *e.g.*, with regard to our *corporeal* being in 1 Cor. xv. 50; Heb. ii. 14; our *intellectual* power in Matt. xvi. 17; our *spiritual* capacity as contrasted with invisible, diabolic agents (*cf.* Ell. on Gal. i. 16). The idea of *carnal desires* or *passions* which is ascribed to the phrase here by some (Jer., Matthies, etc.) would be expressed by σάρξ without αἷμα.—ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς: *but against the principalities*. The formula οὐκ—ἀλλά indicates not a *comparative* negation, as if = "not so much against flesh and blood as against the ἀρχαί," but an absolute. Meyer regards the clause as a case of brachylogy, some term of more *general* sense than πάλη, *e.g.*, μάχη or μαχετέον having to be understood, = "for us there is not a *wrestling* with flesh and blood, but a *fight* with the principalities". This on the ground that the idea of *wrestling* is inconsistent with that of the *panoply*. But while it is true that there is a change in the figure for the time being, there is nothing strange in that, neither is there any incongruity in representing the Christian's *conflict* as a *wrestling*—an *individual* encounter and one *at close quarters*. On the sense of ἀρχαί, *principalities* or *rulers* applied here to the powers of *evil*, see on i. 21 above.—πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας: *against the authorities*. On ἐξουσίαι, here designating *demonic* authorities, see on i. 21 above.—πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκότους [τοῦ αἰῶνος] τούτου: *against the world-rulers of the darkness of this world* (or, *of this darkness*). τοῦ αἰῶνος is inserted after σκότους by the TR, and is found in most cursives, and in such uncials as ℵ³D³EKLP. It is omitted in B ℵ*D*FG, 17, 67², etc., and is rejected by LTTrWHRV. In the NT we have such designations as ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου (John xiv. 30), ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου (2 Cor. iv. 4), applied to Satan. The phrase κοσμοκράτωρ τοῦ σκότους τούτου occurs only here. The noun κοσμοκράτωρ is found in the Orphic Hymns (iii., 3, of Satan), in inscriptions (C. I., 5892, with ref. to the emperor), in Gnostic writings (of the devil), and in the Rabbinical literature in transliterated Hebrew form (of the angel of death, and of kings like the four pursued by Abraham, and Nebuchadnezzar, Evil-Merodach, Belshazzar; *cf.* Wetstein, *in loc.*; Fischer's *Buxtorf*, *Lex.*, p. 996, etc.). According to usage as well as formation, therefore, it means not merely *rulers* (Eth., Goth.), but *world-rulers*, powers dominating the world as such and working everywhere. τοῦ σκότους limits their dominion, however, to the world as it now is in the darkness of its ignorance

k=Col. i. 13; Luke xxii. 53. l Constr., here only. m Matt. xxii. 18 al.; Rom. i. 20 al. n Ch. i. 3 reff.; Ps. xli. 1, xlviii. 5. o Acts vii. 43, xx. 13, 14, xxiii. 31; 2 Tim. iv. 11; Deut. i. 41; Jer. xxvi. 3.

τοῦ [k] σκότους τούτου,[1] πρὸς τὰ [l] πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς [n] ἐπουρανίοις. 13. διὰ τοῦτο [o] ἀναλάβετε τὴν [o] πανοπλίαν τοῦ θεοῦ,

[1] Add του αιωνος, with ℵ³D³EKLP, etc., Syr.*, al., Mac., Ath.-ms., Chr., Thdrt., al.; om. ℵ*ABD*FG 17, 67², 80, most vss., Clem., Orig.-oft., Ath., Eus., Bas., Nyss., Cyr., Cypr., Lucif., Hil., Ambrst., Jer., Tert., etc.

and evil, and suggests the destined termination of their operation.—**πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας**: *against the spirit-forces of wickedness*. The repetition of the **πρὸς** before each of the four powers named in the clause has rhetorical force. Such renderings as "spiritual wickedness" (Tynd., Bish., AV), "spiritual craftiness" (Cran.), *spirituales nequitiae* (Erasm., Beza, Wolf., etc.), are inadequate. The phrase **τὰ πνευματικά** is not the same as **τὰ πνεύματα**, but means properly speaking the *spiritual things* (so Wicl., "the spiritual things of wickedness"). It is possible that the neut. adj. has the *collective* force here; in support of which Meyer and others adduce such phrases as **τὸ πολιτικόν, τὸ ἱππικόν, τὰ λῃστρικά**, etc. But **τὸ πολιτικόν** seems to mean the whole of that section of the community which consists of **πολῖται**; **τὸ ἱππικόν**, also **τὰ ἱππικά** (Polyb., iii., 114, 5) means *cavalry*; and **τὰ λῃστρικά** is used for pirate-vessels. The form **τὸ λῃστικόν**, however, has both the sense of *piracy* (Thucyd., i., 4, 13), and that of a *band of robbers* (Thucyd., ii., 69). This may perhaps justify the sense of *spirit-bands* or *spiritual hosts* here. But it seems most consonant with usage to give the term **τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας** the simple sense of "the spiritual things," *i.e.*, "*elements*, or *forces* of wickedness," without connecting with it the doubtful connotation of *armies*, *hosts*, or *hordes* (*cf.* Abb., *in loc.*). The **πονηρίας** is the gen. of *quality*, = the spirit-forces whose essential character is wickedness.—**ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις**: *in the heavenly regions*. On **τὰ ἐπουράνια** see under i. 3 above. The phrase, of which this is the fifth occurrence in the Epistle, is most naturally understood in the *local* sense which it has in the previous instances. Some depart from this sense and make it = *the heavenly blessings*, giving at the same time the meaning of "for," "in behalf" to **ἐν**, = "for the heavenly possessions". So even Chrys., Theod., and Oec., followed by Witsius, Wolf., etc. But **ἐν** cannot = **ὑπέρ** or **περί**, not even in Matt. vi. 7; John xvi. 30; Acts vii. 29; 1 Cor. ix. 4. Others, retaining the local sense, take the phrase as a designation of the scene of the *combat*, *e.g.* = "in the kingdom of heaven," that being the region in which Christians contend with the enemies of God (Matthies), or "in the air" as contrasted with the *solid ground* (Rück.). But the term qualifies **τὰ πνευματικά**. Forming one idea with that, it dispenses with the article; *cf.* **τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ ἀέρος**, Matt. vi. 26; **τοῖς πλουσίοις ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι**, 1 Tim. vi. 17, etc. It defines the domain of these spirit-forces. Their haunts are those superterrestrial regions, not the highest heavens which are the abode of God, Christ, and angels, but those lower heavens which are at once subcelestial and superterrestrial. The phrase and the idea may be suggested by the Jewish notion of a series of seven heavens, each distinguished from the other, the third or (later) the fourth, *e.g.*, being identified with Paradise. *Cf.* Morfill and Charles, *Book of the Secrets of Enoch*, p. xl. The phrase expresses, therefore, much the same idea as the phrase **τοῦ ἀέρος** in ii. 2. The reason why Paul uses **ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις** and not **ἐν τῷ ἀέρι** here may be, as Meyer suggests, his wish to "bring out *as strongly as possible* the superhuman and superterrestrial nature of these hostile spirits".

Ver. 13. **διὰ τοῦτο ἀναλάβετε τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ**: *wherefore take up the whole armour of God*. **διὰ τοῦτο**, *i.e.*, because your enemies are such as these. **ἀναλαβεῖν** is the accepted term for taking up arms, as **κατατίθεσθαι** is for laying them down (Deut. i. 41; Jer. xxvi. 3).—**ἵνα δυνηθῆτε ἀντιστῆναι ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ πονηρᾷ**: *that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day*. The object of the **ἀντιστῆναι**, *viz.*, the powers of evil, is left to be understood. The **ἡμέρα πονηρά** is inadequately interpreted as the *day of death* (E. Schmid); the *day of judgment* (Jer.); the *present life* (Chrys., Oec., etc.)—which would rather have been **αἰὼν πονηρός**; or the whole period of conflict prepared for us by Satan (Rück., Harl., De Wette, Bleek, etc.). Regard

ἵνα δυνηθῆτε [p] ἀντιστῆναι ἐν τῇ [q] ἡμέρᾳ τῇ [q] πονηρᾷ καὶ ἅπαντα [r] κατεργασάμενοι [1] στῆναι.[2] 14. στῆτε οὖν [s] περιζωσάμενοι τὴν

p Matt. v. 39 al.; abs., here only.

q Ch. v. 16 reff. r=Rom. vii. 15, 17, etc., xv. 18 al.17; Paul only, exc. 1 Pet. iv. 3; James i. 3, 20. s Luke xii. 35 al.; Paul, here only; Dan. x. 5; Ps. lxiv. 6.

[1] κατεργασμενοι A.

[2] στηναι, στητε ουν Orig., Euseb., Dam., Jer., etc.; στητε DFG, d, e, Cypr.; *stare* without στητε ουν Victorin.

must be had to the definiteness given to the **ἡμέρα** by the article, which marks it out as in some sense or other a single day, a critical day, a time of peculiar peril and trial. Hence the choice must be between the *time immediately preceding the Parousia*, the searching day of the future in which the powers of evil will make their last and greatest effort (Meyer, etc.), and the *day of violent temptation and assault*, whenever that may come to us during the present time (Ell., etc.), "any day of which it may be said, 'this is your hour, and the power of darkness'" (Barry; so also Abb.). The latter view is on the whole to be preferred.—**καὶ ἅπαντα κατεργασάμενοι στῆναι**: *and having done all, to stand.* In A we have the variant **κατεργασμένοι**, a misspelling for **κατεργασάμενοι** or for **κατειργασμένοι**. The Vulg. renders *in omnibus perfecti* (following perhaps the reading **κατειργασμένοι**). Some make it = "having *prepared* all things for the conflict" (Erasm., Beza, etc.); but that would be expressed by some such form as **παρασκευασάμενοι** (1 Cor. xiv. 8). Others give it the sense of *overpowering* (Oec., Chrys., Harl., etc.; *cf.* "overcome" in AV margin)—a sense which it has, but not in the NT, as far as appears, and which will not suit the *neut.* (**ἅπαντα**) here. There is no reason to depart from the ordinary sense of the verb, *viz.*, that of *perficere* (*cf.* Plato, *Laws*, iii., p. 686 E; Herod., v., 24, etc.), *doing thoroughly, working out*, especially (the **κατά** being intensive) accomplishing a *difficult* task. Applied to things evil or dishonourable this becomes *perpetrare*. These are the senses which it has in the NT generally and in the Pauline writings in particular (Rom. vii. 15, 17; 2 Cor. xii. 12; Phil. ii. 12, etc.; and in the sense of *perpetrating*, Rom. i. 27, ii. 9; 1 Cor. v. 3; 1 Pet. iv. 3). The **ἅπαντα** refers obviously to the *conflict* in view, and means "all things pertaining to your struggle". The **στῆναι**, in contrast with the **ἀντιστῆναι** or *withstanding*, denotes the final result; the ability to withstand when the fight is on is to be sought with a view to holding one's position when the conflict is at an end,—neither dislodged nor felled, but *standing* victorious at one's post.

Ver. 14. **στῆτε οὖν περιζωσάμενοι τὴν ὀσφὺν ὑμῶν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ**: *stand, therefore, having girded your loins with truth.* In some few authorities **στῆτε οὖν** is omitted (Victor., Ambrstr.); in others the **οὖν** is omitted and **στῆτε** is retained (D*FG, Cyp., etc.). **ὀσφυς** is accentuated **ὀσφῦς** by TR and Treg.; but **ὀσφύς** by LTWH. The aor. **στῆτε** may perhaps be best rendered, "take your stand," the definite act being in view. The spiritual warrior who has kept his position victorious and stood above his conquered foe in one "evil day," is to take his stand again ready to face another such critical day, should it come. The following sentences explain what has to be done if he is thus to stand. The aorists can scarcely be the *contemporary* aorists or definitions of the *way* in which they were to stand; for it would not be the mark of the good soldier that he left his equipment to be attended to till the very time when he had to take up his position. They are proper pasts, stating what has to be done *before* one takes up his stand. First in the list of these articles of equipment is mentioned the girdle. Appropriately so; for the soldier might be furnished with every other part of his equipment, and yet, wanting the girdle, would be neither fully accoutred nor securely armed. His *belt* or *baldric* (**ζωστήρ** or (later) **ζωνή**) was no mere adornment of the soldier, but an essential part of his equipment. Passing round the loins and by the end of the breastplate (in later times supporting the sword), it was of especial use in keeping other parts in place, and in securing the proper soldierly attitude and freedom of movement. The **περιζωσάμενοι** is better rendered (with RV) "having girded your loins," than "having your loins girt" (with AV); for the *girding* is the soldier's *own* act by help of God's grace (*cf.* Luke xii. 35 and the **ἀναζωσάμενοὶ τὰς ὀσφύας** of 1 Pet. i. 13). The sing. **ὀσφύς** is used now and again in

t Luke *l.c.*, reff.; Matt. iii. 4; 1 Pet. i. 13; Isa. xi. 5. u See 1 Cor. iv. 21 reff. v 1 Thess. v. 8; Rev. ix. 9, 17 only; Isa. lix. 17. w Mark vi. 9; Acts xii. 8 only; 2 Chron. xxviii. 15. x Here only; =Ps. ix. 37; see Ezra ii. 68.

t ὀσφὺν ὑμῶν u ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν v θώρακα τῆς δικαιοσύνης, 15. καὶ w ὑποδησάμενοι τοὺς πόδας u ἐν x ἑτοιμασίᾳ τοῦ

the LXX as the rendering of חֲלָצַיִם = the two loins, and so it is used here and in Acts ii. 30; Heb. vii. 5, 10. The **ἐν** in **ἐν ἀληθείᾳ** is the *instrum.* **ἐν**, perhaps with some reference to the other parts being *within* the girdle (Ell.; *cf.* **περιεζωσμένος ἐν δυναστείᾳ**, Ps. lxiv. 7). But what is this **ἀληθεία** which is to make our spiritual cincture? It has been taken in the *objective* sense, the truth of the Gospel (Oec.). But that is afterwards identified with the *sword* (ver. 17). It is *subjective* truth (*cf.* v. 9 above). But in what sense again? In that, says Meyer, of "harmony of knowledge with the objective truth given in the Gospel"; in that, as Ell. puts it, "of the inward practical acknowledgment of the truth as it is in Him" (Christ). But in its subjective applications **ἀληθεία** means most obviously the personal grace of *candour, sincerity, truthfulness* (John viii. 44; 1 Cor. v. 8, xiii. 6; 2 John 1; 3 John 1), as it is used also of the *veracity* of God (Rom. xv. 8). It seems simplest, therefore, and most accordant with usage to take it so here (with Calv., etc.). And this plain grace of *openness, truthfulness, reality*, the mind that will practise no deceits and attempt no disguises in our intercourse with God, is indeed vital to Christian safety and essential to the due operation of all the other qualities of character. In Isa. xi. 5 *righteousness* is combined with truth in this matter of *girding*—**ἔσται δικαιοσύνη ἐζωσμένος τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀληθείᾳ εἰλημένος τὰς πλευράς**—in the case of the Messianic Branch out of the roots of Jesse.—**καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν θώρακα τῆς δικαιοσύνης**: *and having put on the breastplate of righteousness.* As the soldier covers his breast with the **θώραξ** to make it secure against the disabling wound, so the Christian is to endue himself with *righteousness* so as to make his heart and will proof against the fatal thrust of his spiritual assailants. This **δικαιοσύνη** is taken by some (Harl., etc.) as the righteousness of justification, the righteousness of faith. But *faith* is mentioned by itself, and as the **ἀληθεία** was the quality of truthfulness, so the **δικαιοσύνη** is the quality of moral rectitude (*cf.* Rom. vi. 13), as seen in the regenerate. The gen. is to be understood as that of *apposition* or *identity*, = "the breastplate which *is* righteousness". In the analogous passage in 1 Thess. v. 8 the breastplate is *faith and love*, and with it is named the helmet, which is introduced later in this paragraph. In the fundamental passage in Isa. lix. 17 we have the breastplate and the helmet again mentioned together, and the former identified as here with *righteousness*—**ἐνεδύσατο δικαιοσύνην ὡς θώρακα.**

Ver. 15. **καὶ ὑποδησάμενοι τοὺς πόδας**: *and having shod your feet.* So the RV; better than "and your feet shod" of AV. The reference comes in naturally in connection with the **στῆτε**. The soldier, who will make this *stand*, must have his feet protected. The Heb. נַעַל, *sandal*, is represented in the LXX by **ὑπόδημα**, which also occurs repeatedly in the Gospels and Acts, **σανδάλιον** being also used both in the NT (Mark vi. 9; Acts xii. 8), and in the LXX, as well as in Josephus, with the same sense. Here, however, the *military* sandal (Hebr. סָאוֹר, Isa. ix. 4; Lat. *caliga; cf.* Joseph., *Jew. Wars*, vi. 1, 8, and Xen., *Anab.*, iv., 5) is in view, which protected the soldier's feet and made it possible for him to move with quick and certain step.—**ἐν ἑτοιμασίᾳ**: *with the preparedness.* The form **ἑτοιμασία** occurs in later Greek (*e.g.*, Hippocr., p. 24; Joseph., *Antiq.*, x., 1, 2) and in the LXX (*cf.* Ps. x. 17), for the classical **ἑτοιμότης**. It means (*a*) *preparation* in the active sense of *making ready* (Wisdom, xiii., 12); (*b*) a *state of preparedness*, whether *external* (*e.g.*, **ἵππους εἰς ἑτοιμασίαν παρέχειν**, Joseph., *Antiq.*, x., 1, 2), or *internal* (Ps. x. 17); perhaps also (*c*) something fixed, a *foundation* (=Heb. מָכוֹן; Dan. xi. 7). Some have given it this last sense here, either as = *stedfastness* in keeping the faith, or as = on the *foundation*, the strong and certain *ground*, of the Christian religion (Beng., Bleek, etc.). But in harmony with the general idea of the ethical equipment of the Christian, it means *readiness, preparedness of mind.* The **ἐν** is again the *instrum.* prep.—**τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς εἰρήνης**: *of the Gospel of peace.* The first gen. is that of *origin*, the second that of *con-*

[y] εὐαγγελίου τῆς [y] εἰρήνης, 16. [z] ἐπὶ[1] πᾶσιν [a] ἀναλαβόντες τὸν [b] θυρεὸν τῆς πίστεως, [c] ἐν ᾧ δυνήσεσθε[2] πάντα τὰ βέλη τοῦ [d] πονηροῦ

y Here only; see Mark i. 14; Acts xx. 24; Isa. lii. 7; Rom. x. 15. z Luke iii. 20, xvi. 26; 2 Cor. vii. 4; Col. iii. 14; 1 Thess. iii. 7, 9. a Ver. 13 reff. b Here only; 2 Kings i. 21. c Simply local, see note. d=(Matt. v. 37, 39)? xiii. 19 al.; (2 Thess. iii. 3)? 1 John ii. 13, v. 18.

[1] επι ADEFGKL, etc., Syr.-scr., Arm., Goth., Chr., Euth., etc.; for επι, εν ℵBP 17, 26, 31-7, 80, 118, 213, It., Vulg., Method., Naz., Cyr.-jer., Cypr., etc.

[2] δυνασθαι DFG, d, e, f, g, m, Victor., Jer.

tents, = "the preparedness which comes from the Gospel whose message is peace". The **εἰρήνη** here is doubtless *peace with God* (Rom. v. 1), that peace which alone imparts the sense of freedom, relieves us of what burdens us, and gives the spirit of courageous readiness for the battle with evil. The phrase "the Gospel of peace" is elsewhere associated with the idea of the message preached (Isa. lii. 7; Nahum i. 15; *cf.* Rom. x. 15). Here, however, the readiness is not zeal in *proclaiming* the Gospel, but promptitude with reference to the *conflict*. The *preparedness*, the mental alacrity with which we are inspired by the Gospel with its message of peace with God, is to be to us the protection and equipment which the sandals that cover his feet are to the soldier. With this we shall be helped to face the foe with courage and with promptitude.

Ver. 16. **ἐπὶ [ἐν] πᾶσιν ἀναλαβόντες τὸν θυρεὸν τῆς πίστεως**: *in addition to all* (or, *withal*) *taking up the shield of faith*. The readings vary between **ἐπί** and **ἐν**. The former, that of the TR, is supported by ADGKL, most cursives, and such Versions as the Syr.-P, and the Arm.; the latter, by BℵP, 17, Syr.-H., Boh., Vulg., etc. The latter is accepted by L (*non-marg.*) TTrWHRV; and with it the sense is "*in* or *among all*," aptly rendered *withal* by the RV. With **ἐπί** the sense will be neither "*above* all" (AV) as if = *most especially*, nor "*over* all," with reference to *position;* but, in accordance with the general idea of "accession," "superaddition" expressed by **ἐπί** (*cf.* Ell.), *in addition to all* (*cf.* Luke iii. 20). **θυρεός**, in Homer = a stone put against a door (**θύρα**) to block or shut it (*Od.*, ix., 240, etc.), but later = a *shield*, is the large, oblong shield, Lat. *scutum*, as distinguished from the smaller, circular **ἀσπίς**, the Lat. *clipeus*. It is described by Polybius (vi., 23, 2) as the first portion of the **πανοπλία**, and is appropriate here where the Christian is presented under the figure of a heavy-armed soldier. **τῆς πίστεως**, the gen. of *appos.* or *identity*, = "the shield which *is*, or *consists of*, faith"; **πίστις** having here also its distinctive NT sense of *saving* faith—the faith by which come the Divine forgiveness and the power of a new life.—**ἐν ᾧ δυνήσεσθε πάντα τὰ βέλη τοῦ πονηροῦ [τὰ] πεπυρωμένα σβέσαι**: *wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the evil one*. **ἐν ᾧ** = "by means of which," as the shield is placed before us to cover us from the stroke. There is no necessity for putting on **δυνήσεσθε** the sense of the remote future, as if the last conflict preceding the Judgment (Mey.) alone were in view. It refers to the future generally—to any time in our Christian course when we shall need special power for special assault. The art. **τά** is omitted before **πεπυρωμένα** by BD*G, etc., but inserted by the mass of authorities. Lach. deletes it; Treg. and WH bracket it. The anarthrous participle might have the qualitative sense, = "fire-tipped as they are" (so Abb.). If the article is retained, it would be implied, as Meyer remarks, that the wicked one has also other arrows to discharge besides these fearsome and pre-eminently destructive ones, which are mentioned here in order to express in its utmost force the terror of the attack. The **βέλη** in view are not *poisoned* arrows (referred to, as is supposed, in Job vi. 4; Ps. xxxviii. 2), which were not *flaming* missiles; but arrows tipped with tow, pitch or such like material, and set on fire before they were discharged, the **πυρφόροι ὀϊστοί** (Thucyd., ii., 75, 4), or **βέλη πυρφόρα** (Diod., xx. 96), the *malleoli* used by the Romans (Cic., *Pro Mil.*, 24), the Greeks (Herod., viii., 52), and, as it would seem, the Hebrews (Ps. vii. 13). The **σβέσαι** has its own appropriateness here, the **θυρεός** being constructed of material (wood and leather, Polyb., *Hist.*, ii., 23, 3), which not only prevented the missile from penetrating, but was proof against its fire and let it burn itself out. **τοῦ πονηροῦ**, in harmony with the general idea of a personal stand against spiritual foes, must be masc., "the Evil One," the Devil.

e 1 Cor. vii. 9; 2 Cor. xi. 29; 2 Pet. iii. 12; Rev. i. 15, iii. 18; Prov. x. 20. f Matt. xii. 20 al.; 1 Thess. v. 19; Heb. xi. 34. g 1 Thess. v. 8 only; Isa. lix. 17. h Luke ii. 30 reff.; Acts xxviii. 28. i = Luke ii. 28, xvi. 6, xxii. 17 only. k Heb. iv. 12 al. fr. l Ch. v. 26 reff.; Acts xv. 27, 32. m 2 Cor. ix. 12 al. fr. n Acts. i. 14; Phil. iv. 6; 1 Tim. ii. 1, v. 5; 2 Chron. vi. 19 al.

τὰ [1] πεπυρωμένα σβέσαι. 17. καὶ τὴν περικεφαλαίαν τοῦ σωτηρίου δέξασθε, [2] καὶ τὴν μάχαιραν τοῦ πνεύματος, ὅ ἐστιν ῥῆμα θεοῦ, 18. διὰ πάσης προσευχῆς καὶ δεήσεως προσευχό-

[1] insert τα ℵAD³EKLP, etc., Clem., Orig., etc.; om. τα BD*FG.

[2] Om. δεξασθε DFG, d, e, g, m, Cypr., Luc., Victorin.; δεξασθαι AD³EKLP, 17, etc.

Ver. 17. **καὶ τὴν περικεφαλαίαν τοῦ σωτηρίου δέξασθε**: *and receive the helmet of salvation.* The construction changes here, as is often the case with Paul, and passes from the participial form to the direct imperative. There is no necessity, however, for marking this by a full stop at the close of the preceding sentence (with Lach., Tisch., and RV). **δέξασθε** is omitted by D*FG, Cyp., etc., and becomes **δέξασθαι** in AD³EKLP, 17, etc. The verb has its proper sense here, not merely "take," but "receive," *i.e.*, as a gift from the Lord, a thing provided and offered by Him. The *helmet* required for the defence of the head is introduced both in Isa. lix. 17 and 1 Thess. v. 8. It is noticed before the *sword;* for, the left hand holding the shield, when the sword is grasped by the right, there remains no hand free to put on any other part (Mey.). **τοῦ σωτηρίου** is again an *appos.* gen, = "the helmet which *is* salvation". In 1 Thess. v. 8 the helmet is not the salvation itself, as here and in Isa. lix. 17, but the *hope* of it. Paul's usual term is **σωτηρία.** In Tit. ii. 11 he uses the adj. **σωτήριος** in the sense of "bringing salvation". This is the only instance of his use of the abstr. neuter for **σωτηρία.** It occurs, however, in Luke's writings (Luke ii. 30, iii. 6; Acts xxviii. 28, and in the LXX).—**καὶ τὴν μάχαιραν τοῦ πνεύματος**: *and the sword of the Spirit.* The gen. here cannot be that of *appos.* (although it is so taken by Harl., Olsh., etc.), for the following explanation renders that inept. It must be the gen. of *origin*, = "the sword supplied by the Spirit".—**ὅ ἐστι ῥῆμα Θεοῦ**: *which is the word of God.* Some strangely make the **ὅ** refer to the **πνεύματος**, = "the Spirit who is the Word of God" (Olsh., Von Sod., etc.); but nowhere else is the Spirit identified with the Word. The **ὅ** is explanatory of the **μάχαιρα,** the neut. form being due to the usual attraction. In Heb. iv. 2 we have the **λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ** compared in respect of superior sharpness or penetrating power to a *two-edged sword.* Here we have the phrase **ῥῆμα Θεοῦ,** which is to be understood, in accordance with the proper sense of **ῥῆμα,** as the *spoken* Word, the *preached* Gospel, and this in its length and breadth—not in the *commandments* of God only (Flatt), nor in His *threatenings* alone (Koppe), nor even yet in the sense of the *written* Word, the Scriptures (Moule). The sword is the only *offensive* weapon in the panoply. But it is indispensable. For, while the Christian soldier is exhibited here mainly in the attitude of defence, as one who *stands*, in order to take his position and keep his ground, thrust and cut will be required. The preached Gospel, "the power of God" (Rom. i. 16; 1 Cor. i. 18), is the weapon provided by the Spirit for meeting the lunge of the assailant and beating him back. With this the description of the panoply comes to an end. It has not followed the usual way, but has left out certain parts (*spear* or *lance*, and *greaves*, to wit), and has introduced others (the *girdle* and the *sandals*) which are not enumerated in Polybius's list of the accoutrements of the man-at-arms. It has kept only in part by the Isaianic description (Isa. lix. 17), including the breastplate and the helmet, but passing over the "garments" and the "cloke". Nor has it much more in common with the fuller description in Wisd. v. 18, 20, which may also have been more or less in the writer's mind—**λήψεται πανοπλίαν τὸν ζῆλον αὐτοῦ . . . ἐνδύσεται θώρακα δικαιοσύνης, καὶ περιθήσεται κόρυθα κρίσιν ἀνυπόκριτον. λήψεται ἀσπίδα ἀκαταμάχητον ὁσιότητα, ὀξυνεῖ δὲ ἀπότομον ὀργὴν εἰς ῥομφαίαν.** It differs also in the *application* of the figures of the breastplate and the helmet from the briefer Pauline description in 1 Thess. v. 8. But the capacity of bearing a variety of applications, each as just in its place as the other, is the quality of all figurative language that is apt and true to nature.

Ver. 18. **διὰ πάσης προσευχῆς καὶ**

μενοι [o] ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ [p] ἐν πνεύματι, καὶ [q] εἰς αὐτὸ [1] [r] ἀγρυπνοῦντες [2] [o] Luke xxi. 36 only. ἐν πάσῃ [s] προσκαρτερήσει καὶ [3] [n] δεήσει περὶ [4] πάντων τῶν [t] ἁγίων [p] Ch. ii. 22 reff.

[q] 1 Pet. iv. 7; Jude 20; (Rom. ix. 17, xiii. 6; 2 Cor. v. 5, but all w. τοῦτο). [r] Mark xiii. 33; Luke xxi. 36; Heb. xiii. 17 only; Cant. v. 2. [s] Here only. [t] Ch. i. 1 reff.

[1] After αυτο insert τουτο D^3EKLP, etc., Chrys.-text., Thdrt., Dam.-text., al.; om. ℵABD*FG (αυτον D*FG) It., Vulg., Lat. Fathers, Copt., etc.

[2] After αγρ. insert παντοτε DEFG, It., Syr., Ar.-erp., Bas.

[3] προσκ. και om. D* (εν π. τη δ.) FG, It., Victorin., etc.

[4] For περι, υπερ D*E*FG 37, 47, 73, 80, Syr. (with περι in marg.), Thdrt.

δεήσεως προσευχόμενοι: *with all prayer and supplication praying*. This clause is a further explanation of the manner in which the injunction **στῆτε οὖν** is to be carried. It is connected by some with the preceding **δέξασθε**; but it is not appropriate to the **δέξασθε**, which represents a single, definite act, while it is entirely suitable to the continuous attitude expressed by **στῆτε**. This great requirement of standing ready for the combat can be made good only when prayer, constant, earnest, spiritual prayer, is added to the careful equipment with all the parts of the panoply. Meyer would separate **προσευχόμενοι** from the **διὰ πάσης**, etc., and make it the beginning of a new, independent clause. His reason is that it is impossible to pray with *every* kind of prayer on *every occasion*. But the absoluteness of the statement is only of the kind that is often seen in Paul, as, *e.g.*, when he charges us to pray **ἀδιαλείπτως** (1 Thess. v. 17). **διά** has the familiar sense of "by means of," in the particular aspect of *formal cause*, the *manner* in which a thing is done (*cf.* **εἶπε διὰ παραβολῆς**, Luke viii. 4; **εἶπε διὰ ὁράματος**, Acts xviii. 9; **τῷ λόγῳ δι' ἐπιστολῶν**, 2 Cor. v. 11, etc.; Grimm-Thayer, *Lex.*, p. 133). The **πάσης** has the force of "*every kind* of". The distinction attempted to be drawn between **προσευχή** (=תְּפִלָּה) and **δέησις** (=תְּחִנָּה), as between prayer for *blessing* and prayer for the withholding or removing of *evil*, cannot be made good. The only difference between the two terms appears to be that **προσευχή** means prayer in general, *precatio*, and **δέησις**, a special form of prayer, *petition*, *rogatio*.—**ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ**: *in every season*. Not merely in the crisis of the conflict or on special occasions, but habitually, in all kinds of times.—**ἐν πνεύματι**: *in the Spirit*. The reference is not to *our* spirit, as if = with *inward devoutness* or with *heart-felt* pleading (Erasm., Grot., etc.), nor as opposed to **βαττολογεῖν** (Chrys.), but "in the Holy Spirit," the Holy Spirit being the sphere or element in which alone true prayer of all different kinds can proceed and from which it draws its inspiration; *cf.* the great statement on the *intercession* of the Spirit (Rom. viii. 26, 27); also Gal. iv. 6, and especially Jude 20, **ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ προσευχόμενοι**. Thus the praying is defined in respect of its *variety* and *earnestness* (**διὰ πάσης**, etc.), its *constancy* (**ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ**), and its *spiritual reality* or its "holy sphere" (*cf.* Ell.).—**καὶ εἰς αὐτὸ [τοῦτο] ἀγρυπνοῦντες**: *and thereunto watching*. The **τοῦτο** of the TR inserted after **αὐτό** has the support only of such MSS. as D^3JK, etc.; it is omitted in BAℵ, etc., while **αὐτόν** alone occurs in D*G. **τοῦτο**, therefore, is to be deleted, as is done by LTTrWHRV. The **εἰς τοῦτο** refers not to what is to follow, as, *e.g.*, to the **ἵνα μοι δοθῇ** (Holzh.), but to what immediately precedes. The clause, therefore, attaches (by the **καί**) a more particular requirement to the general statement just made, specifying something that is to be done *with a view* (**εἰς τοῦτο**) to the fulfilment of the large injunction as to praying. That is *watchfulness*, *readiness*, and, as the next words state, watchfulness in *intercession*, **ἀγρυπνεῖν** = to *keep awake* or to *keep watch*, and then to be *attentive*, *vigilant* (Mark xiii. 33; Luke xxi. 36), is much the same as **γρηγορεῖν** and **νήφειν**. So far as any distinction is made between them it may be that **ἀγρυπνεῖν** expresses *alertness* as opposed to *listlessness*, **γρηγορεῖν** watchfulness as the result of *effort*, and **νήφειν** *wariness*, the wakefulness that is safe against drowsiness (Sheldon Green, *Crit. Notes on the N. T.*, *sub* Mark xiii. 33).—**ἐν πάσῃ προσκαρτερήσει καὶ δεήσει**: *in all perseverance and supplication*. The only occurrence of the noun **προσκαρτέρησις**. The verb, however, is found a number of times, both in profane Greek and in the NT, especially in Acts (Mark iii.

u=1 Cor. xii. 8.
v See note.
w Matt. v. 2 reff.; Acts viii. 35, x. 34 al.
x Phil. i. 20; Col. ii. 15; =Paul only.
y z Ch. i. 9 reff.

19. καὶ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ, ἵνα μοι δοθῇ [1] [u]λόγος [v]ἐν [w]ἀνοίξει τοῦ στόματός μου [x]ἐν [x]παῤῥησίᾳ [y]γνωρίσαι τὸ [z]μυστήριον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου,[2]

[1] δοθειη, with some mss.; δοθη most MSS., mss., Vss., Ff.

[2] Insert του ευαγγελιου ℵADEFKLP, etc., d, e, f, Vulg., Syr., Copt., etc.; om. BFG, g, Victorin., Tert. (citing freely), Ambrst.

9; Acts i. 14, ii. 42, 46, vi. 4, viii. 13, x. 7; Rom. xii. 12, xiii. 6; Col. iv. 2) in the sense of *giving heed to* (*e.g.*, τῇ προσευχῇ, Acts i. 14, etc.), *continuing in*, etc. The *perseverance* or *stedfastness* in view is in the matter of prayer, so that the "in every kind of perseverance and supplication" is much the same as "in every kind of persevering supplication," although in the case of a hendiadys proper the order would rather have been ἐν δεήσει καὶ προσκαρτερήσει.—περὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων: *for all the saints*. Thus in order to prayer of the kind described—prayer comprehensive, continuous, and moving in the domain of the Spirit of God, there must be *intercession* for all and *watchfulness* and *perseverance* in it. Only when we constantly pray in this way for *others* can we pray for *ourselves* "with all prayer and supplication in every season in the Spirit".

Ver. 19. καὶ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ: *and for me*. καί has here its *adjunctive* force, in the special form of appending the particular to the general (Win.-Moult., p. 544), = "and for me in particular". Paul passes from the requirement of intercession for all to that of intercession for himself, and that with a view to a special gift from God, to wit, freedom of utterance in preaching. The περί of the former clause becomes ὑπέρ in the present. This suggests the existence of some distinction between the two preps., and some have attempted to show that ὑπέρ alone expresses the idea of *care for* one, while περί denotes a more distant relation (Harl., etc.). But it is impracticable to establish either that or any other tangible distinction. ὑπέρ may be, generally speaking, more applicable to *persons*, and περί to *things*. But here both are used of persons. Even in classical Greek they were often used as if interchangeable (*e.g.*, Demosth., *Phil.*, ii., p. 74, 35), and in later Greek, both biblical and non-biblical, they seem to have lost any distinction they once may have had.—ἵνα μοι δοθείη [δοθῇ] λόγος: *that to me may be given utterance*. The δοθείη of the TR rests on very slender cursive evidence; δοθῇ is read by BℵAD EFGKLP, etc., and must be substituted. A few authorities place μοι *after* δοθῇ (ℵ*, d, e, f, vg, Victor., etc.); but in most it is inserted *before* it. δοθῇ has the position of emphasis—the utterance for which they were to pray in Paul's behalf is regarded as a *gift* from God. For this use of λόγος *cf.* 1 Cor. i. 5; 2 Cor. xi. 2.—ἐν ἀνοίξει τοῦ στόματός μου: *in opening my mouth*. Not "*that* I may open my mouth" (AV), but "*when* I open my mouth". The ἐν marks the *occasion* of the action, and the action itself is that in which the *gift* (δοθῇ) of Divine help is sought. The phrase ἀνοίγειν τὸ στόμα does not of itself denote any special *kind* of utterance, whether *unreserved* (Calv., De Wette, etc.), *unpremeditated* (Oec.), or other. If it conveys in any case the idea of a certain *quality* of speech, that is due to the context; as in 2 Cor. vi. 11, where it is conjoined with the phrase ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν πεπλάτυνται. It means simply the opening of the mouth to speak, or the act of speaking; but both in the OT and in the NT it appears to have a certain *pathetic* (Mey.), or rather *solemn* force (Ell.), being used of grave and important utterances on which much depended (Job iii. 1; Dan. x. 16; Matt. v. 2; Acts viii. 33, xviii. 14).—ἐν παρρησίᾳ: *with boldness*. Statement of the thing specially sought, and recognised as to be obtained only by the gift of God, to wit, *fearless*, *confident freedom* whenever occasion came to preach the Gospel. παρρησία primarily = *freedom in speaking* (Acts iv. 13; 2 Cor. iii. 12); then *frankness*, *unreserve*, or *plainness* in speaking (Mark viii. 32; John x. [24], xi. 14, xvi. 25, etc.); and *boldness*, *assurance*, as opposed, *e.g.*, to αἰσχύνεσθαι (Phil. i. 20; 1 John iii. 21, v. 14); and with the fundamental idea of freedom or confidence in *speaking* again suggesting itself (1 John ii. 28, iv. 17; see also under iii. 12 above).—γνωρίσαι τὸ μυστήριον [τοῦ εὐαγγελίου]: *to make known the mystery* [*of the Gospel*]. The τοῦ εὐαγγελίου of the TR has large support (ℵADEKLP, Vulg., Syr., Copt., etc.). It is omitted by BFgrG, Victor., etc., and is deleted by LWH. The *gen.* is probably that of *contents*, or one of the various forms of the *gen. possess.*, = the

20. ὑπὲρ οὗ [a] πρεσβεύω ἐν [b] ἁλύσει, ἵνα [c] ἐν αὐτῷ [d] παῤῥησιάσωμαι [a] 2 Cor. v. 20 only. [b] Acts xxviii. 20; [e] ὡς δεῖ με λαλῆσαι.

(Paul); 2 Tim. i. 16. [c] See note. [d] Acts ix. 26 al.; 1 Thess. ii. 2 only; Prov. xx. 9 al. [e] Col. iv. 4.

mystery *contained in* the Gospel or *belonging to* it. On **μυστήριον** see under i. 9 above.—The connection of the several clauses in this verse is variously understood. Some connect **ἐν ἀνοίξει τοῦ στόματός μου** with the following **ἐν παῤῥησίᾳ.** So Grotius, who explains it thus—"ut ab hac custodia militari liber per omnem urbem perferre possem sermonem"; but **παῤῥησία** does not apply to freedom of *movement*, and here it has a sense in harmony with the following **παῤῥησιάσωμαι.** Others attach the **ἐν ἀνοίξει** closely with the **λόγος** as a definition of it, = "that utterance may be given me by the opening of my mouth" (Cornel. à Lap., Harl., Olsh., Von Soden, Abb., etc.). This makes the "opening of the mouth" the act of *God;* in support of which interpretation appeal is made to the terms in Ezek. iii. 27, xxix. 31, xxxii. 22; Ps. li. 15. The absence of the article, and the analogous passage in Col. iv. 3 are also thought to favour this. But the terms in Col. iv. 3 are different—**ἵνα Θεὸς ἀνοίξῃ ἡμῖν θύραν τοῦ λόγου,** and the construction makes the **δοθῇ** and the **ἄνοιξις τοῦ στόματος** practically one and the same thing. The simplest constructions are these two—(1) to connect **ἐν παῤῥησίᾳ** with what *precedes*, and with the **λόγος** not the **ἄνοιξις,** = "that utterance, and that with boldness, may be given to me when I undertake to open my mouth with a view to make known the mystery of the Gospel"; and (2) to connect **ἐν παῤῥησίᾳ** with what follows, to wit, the **γνωρίσαι,** = "that to me utterance may be given when I open my mouth, that with boldness I may make known the mystery of the Gospel". The latter is preferred by Meyer, Ell., WH, etc. It is followed by the RV text, "in opening my mouth, to make known with boldness," etc.; while the RV margin gives "in opening my mouth with boldness, to make known the mystery," etc. The former construction gives a good sense for each particular term and a simple connection, if the **ἐν παῤῥησίᾳ** is taken to define not the *opening of the mouth*, but the *utterance*, the **λόγος,** which is the main thought. On the whole the latter is perhaps to be preferred, the need of *utterance*, power of speech, when occasion offers itself to preach, being first mentioned, and this gift of utterance being next defined in respect of its object, *viz.*, to give fearless confidence in making the Gospel known.

Ver. 20. **ὑπὲρ οὗ πρεσβεύω ἐν ἁλύσει:** *in behalf of which I am an ambassador in a chain.* The **οὗ** is best referred, not to **τοῦ εὐαγγελίου,** but to **τὸ μυστήριον,** the mystery contained in the Gospel being the thing that Paul desired to make known (**γνωρίσαι**). So in Col. iv. 3 it is this **μυστήριον** that the writer is to utter (**λαλῆσαι**) and on account of which he is bound (**δέδεμαι**). **πρεσβεύω** = "I act as ambassador," only here and in 2 Cor. v. 20. The **ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ** of the latter passage is left to be understood here. The legation or embassage in Christ's cause, which Paul here ascribes to himself, is not to be limited to the *Roman Court* (Mich.), but is to be understood as to the whole Gentile world, in the wide sense of the *commission* given (Acts ix. 15, xvii. 15); the *debt* professed (Rom. i. 14); the *office* claimed (Rom. xi. 13), and recognised (Gal. ii. 9). The noun **ἅλυσις,** which is not of frequent occurrence in classical Greek, means there a *chain* (Herod., ix., 74; Eurip., *Or.*, 984); also a woman's ornament, a bracelet (Aristoph., *Frag.*, Mem., ii., p. 1079). It is taken by some to be a word of general application, denoting a chain or bond by which any part of the body may be bound, and it is questioned (*e.g.*, by Mey.), whether it is distinguished from **πέδη** as *hand*-fetter from *foot*-fetter. But, while in such passages as Rev. xx. 1 the specific sense may not be required, it seems clear that the distinction between *manacle* and *fetter* does obtain (*cf.* Polyb., iii., 82, 8); that this distinction is made in Mark v. 4; and that **ἅλυσις** is used of the "handcuff" by which a prisoner was attached to his guard (Joseph., *Antiq.*, xviii., 6, 7, 10; Acts xii. 6, xxi. 33, etc.; *cf.* Light., *Phil.*, p. 8). This may be its meaning here, and there will be no necessity for taking it to be a *collective* sing. = bonds; of which use indeed, though possible (*cf.* Bernh., *Synt.*, ii., 1, p. 58), there does not appear to be any clear example in the NT itself. And such phrases as **εἰς τὴν ἅλυσιν ἐμπίπτειν** (Polyb., iv., 76, 5, xxi., 3, 3) are inconclusive, the article giving the word the generic sense. It has been thought that the expression points to the *custodia militaris* endured by Paul in Rome (Acts xxviii. 16, 20; *cf.* 2 Tim. i.

f Col. iv. 7; ch. i. 15. g Here only. h (Ch. v. 1 reff.); see 1 Cor. xv. 58 reff. i Col. iv. 7 only.

21. Ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε καὶ ὑμεῖς[1] [f]τὰ κατ' ἐμὲ, [g]τί πράσσω, πάντα[2] ὑμῖν [g]γνωρίσει[3] Τυχικὸς ὁ [h]ἀγαπητὸς [h]ἀδελφὸς καὶ πιστὸς [i]διά-

[1] και υμ. ειδ. (ιδ. AD*FG, al.) ℵADEFG, 108-14-18-20, al., It., Vulg., al., Thdrt., some Lat. Fathers; ειδητε και υμεις BKL, etc., Syr. Arm., Eth., Chr., Dam., Jer., Ambrst., etc.

[2] παντα om. D*FG, it., Syr., Jer.

[3] γν. υμ. ℵBDEFGP 37, 116-20, It., al., Ambrst.; υμιν γνωρισει AKL, etc., Vulg., Syr.-P., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., etc.

16; Beza, Grot., Paley, Steyer, etc.). That is possible, and indeed even probable, so far as the *custodia* is concerned. But the description might apply to the imprisonment in Cæsarea as well as to that in Rome. The real point of the clause is in the view it gives of the need of the **παρρησία** and of the *intercessions* that should bring that gift.—**ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ παρρησιάσωμαι ὡς δεῖ με λαλῆσαι**: *in order that therein I may speak boldly, as I ought to speak*. How is this purpose-clause to be connected? Some attach it to the **πρεσβεύω** (Beng., Meyer, Von Soden), as if = "I act as ambassador in a chain with the object of speaking boldly," etc. Others connect it with the whole foregoing clause, making it *subordinate* to that, and an explanation of the object of the *gift of utterance*, = "that utterance may be given to me to make known the mystery, with the view that I should speak boldly" (Harl.). But **ἵνα** is repeatedly used to introduce something that is not *subordinate* to, but *coordinate* with, what is stated in a former **ἵνα** clause (Rom. viii. 13; Gal. iii. 14; 1 Cor. xii. 20; 2 Cor. ix. 3). It is best, therefore, to take it so here, and to understand the clause as giving a *second* object contemplated in the **προσευχόμενοι** and **ἀγρυπνοῦντες**, etc. First the gift of *utterance*, and now secondly the gift more particularly of a *boldness* or *freedom* (**παρρησιάσωμαι**) in preaching such as *became* the Apostle's office and responsibility (**ὡς δεῖ με λαλῆσαι**). The **αὐτῷ** refers to the **μυστήριον** which was to be preached. The **ἐν** is taken by some (*e.g.*, Harl.) to denote the *source* or *ground* of the *boldness* in speaking (**παρρησιάσωμαι**). But it is *God* who is named as the source of such boldness (**ἐπαρρησιασάμεθα ἐν τῷ Θεῷ**, 1 Thess. ii. 2). It might be an instance of **ἐν** expressing that *on* which a certain power operates or *in* which it shows itself (as in **ἵνα οὕτω γένηται ἐν ἐμοί**, 1 Cor. ix. 15; **ἐν ἡμῖν μάθητε**, 1 Cor. iv. 6; *cf.* Thayer-Grimm, *Lex.*, p. 210). But it is best understood as the note of that *in* which one is *busied* (*cf.* Acts xxii. 12; 1 Tim. iv. 15; Col. iv. 2, etc.), and so = "that, occupied with that mystery, *i.e.*, in *proclaiming* it, I may speak boldly" (Mey.).

Vv. 21-22. Statement regarding Tychicus and his mission.

Ver. 21. **ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε καὶ ὑμεῖς [καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰδῆτε] τὰ κατ' ἐμέ, τί πράσσω**: *but that ye also may know my affairs, how I do*. The metabatic **δέ**, passing on to a different subject. The order **καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰδῆτε** is given in ℵADF, etc.; **εἰδῆτε καὶ ὑμεῖς** in BKL, Syr., etc. The evidence is almost equally balanced. LTTr prefer the former order; WH give it in the margin. The **καί** has its proper force of "also," and points, therefore, to others as well as the Ephesians as possessing or being interested in the knowledge of Paul's affairs. Those who take the Epistle to the Colossians to be prior to this one, naturally think of the Colossians as in view. But in the Epistle itself there is nothing to indicate who these others were. For **τὰ κατ' ἐμέ** = "my circumstances," *cf.* Phil. i. 22; Col. iv. 7; also Tob. x. 8; 1 Esdr. i. 22. **τί πράσσω**, not = "what I do," but "how I fare," in the reflexive sense (Lat., *me habeo*) common from Æschylus downwards. Here it is explanatory of **τὰ κατ' ἐμέ**. — **πάντα ὑμῖν γνωρίσει [γνωρίσει ὑμῖν] Τυχικός**: *Tychicus shall make known to you*. **πάντα** is omitted in D¹F, Syr., etc. **ὑμῖν** is placed by the TR *before* **γνωρίσει** (as in AKL, Syr.-P., Chr., Theod., etc.; *after* it by LTTr WHRV (as in BℵDEFGP, 17, 37, 116, 120, Syr.-Sch., Copt., etc.). **Τυχικός**, usually so accented, but **Τύχικος** in WH, is mentioned again in Acts xx. 4; Col. iv. 7; 2 Tim. iv. 12; Tit. iii. 12. We gather from these passages that he was a native of proconsular Asia (Acts xx. 4), possibly of Ephesus itself (see Light., *Philip.*, p. 11); that he was with Paul towards the close of his third missionary

κονος [k] ἐν κυρίῳ, 22. ὃν ἔπεμψα πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο, ἵνα γνῶτε τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν καὶ [l] παρακαλέσῃ τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν. 23. Εἰρήνη τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς καὶ [m] ἀγάπη [1] μετὰ πίστεως ἀπὸ θεοῦ

k Acts xxiv. 15 reff.
l=2 Cor. i. 4 al. fr.
m 2 Cor. xiii. 13; 1 Thess. iii. 6; Jude 2.

[1] For αγαπη, ελεος A.

journey (Acts xx. 4); and again at the time when the Epistle to the Colossians was written; and yet again at the end of the Apostle's career (Tit. iii. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 12). It is probable that he went to Jerusalem, as Trophimus did (Acts xxi. 29), in all likelihood as a delegate of his Church, the words **ἄχρις τῆς Ἀσίας** not belonging to the true text of Acts xx. 4. We find him here charged with the delivery of the circular letter known as the Epistle to the Ephesians, probably at the chief centres, Laodicea, Colossæ, etc., where Christian communities had been formed in Asia. He is mentioned also in connection with missions to Crete and to Ephesus (Tit. iii. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 12).—**ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἀδελφὸς καὶ πιστὸς διάκονος ἐν Κυρίῳ**: *the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord.* In the sister Epistle he is described in the same terms, but with the addition of **καὶ σύνδουλος. πιστός** = *faithful*, in the sense of *trusty*, as in Matt. xxiv. 45 and often elsewhere. The **ἐν Κυρίῳ** defines the **διάκονος**, and does not refer to the whole clause. The service to Paul was service rendered *in the Lord*, in Christ's fellowship and Spirit. The term **διάκονος** does not carry here the idea of ecclesiastical office, such as the *deaconship* proper, but refers to ministrations rendered to Paul himself, and so is "servant" or "minister" in the general sense. So in Col. iv. 7 he is called not only **πιστὸς διάκονος**, but Paul's *fellow-servant* (**σύνδουλος**) in the Lord. This is Paul's commendation of him to the Churches which he was to visit.

Ver. 22. **ὃν ἔπεμψα πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο**: *whom I have sent unto you for this very purpose.* **ἔπεμψα**, in idiomatic English = "I have written," but literally = "I did write". If it were certain that the Epistle to the Colossians preceded that to the Ephesians, that the special mission on which Tychicus was sent with Onesimus to Colossæ took place before Paul wrote the Epistle to the Ephesians, and that he found some opportunity of forwarding the latter Epistle also in the course of Tychicus's journey, the **ἔπεμψα** would have its usual aorist sense, referring to a past act. Failing this, it must be taken as an instance of the *epistolary* aor., the mission being *coincident* with the writing of the letter, but contemplated from the view-point of the *recipients* of the letter, to whom it was a thing of the past. The epistolary aor. certainly occurs in Latin, in the use of *scripsi*, etc. (*cf.* Madvig, *Gr.*, § 345). How far its use extends in the NT is still a moot question, some finding many cases, *e.g.*, **ἔγραψα** in Gal. vi. 11; Philem. 19, 21; 1 Pet. v. 12; 1 John ii. 14, 21, 26, v. 13; **ἐπέστειλα**, Heb. xiii. 22; **ἔπεμψα, συνέπεμψα** in 2 Cor. viii. 18, 22; Eph. vi. 22; Col. iv. 8; Phil. ii. 28; Philem. 11, etc.; while others (*e.g.*, Blass) restrict it to **ἔπεμψα** in Acts xxiii. 30; Phil. ii. 28; Col. iv. 8; Philem. 11, etc. (*cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 347; Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 194; Lightf. on Gal. iv. 11; Col. iv. 8; Ell. on Gal. iv. 11.—**ἵνα γνῶτε τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν**: *that ye may know our state.* **τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν** will naturally have the same sense as the **τὰ κατ' ἐμέ**, the **ἡμῶν** including Paul's companions with himself. It is well rendered "our state" by the RV; "our affairs" by the AV. The information regarding Paul and his friends would not be confined to the letter, but would be given no doubt also by Tychicus by word of mouth.—**καὶ παρακαλέσῃ τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν**: *and that he may comfort your hearts.* **παρακαλεῖν** means most frequently either to *exhort* or (in later Greek as well as in the NT) to *beseech*. Rarely in non-biblical Greek has it the sense of *comforting* or *encouraging*; but in the LXX it represents נָחַם, and in the NT it has these senses, and also once that of *instructing* (Tit. i. 9). Here it means to *comfort*, or to *encourage*; probably the former, with respect both to Paul's troubles already mentioned (iii. 13 above) and their own.

Vv. 23-24. Closing Benediction.

Ver. 23. **εἰρήνη τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς καὶ ἀγάπη μετὰ πίστεως**: *peace be to the brethren and love with faith.* Paul's benedictions are usually addressed *directly* to the reader, **μεθ' ὑμῶν** or some similar form being employed. This one is addressed to the *brethren* in the third person, as is perhaps more appropriate in a circular letter. There is nothing to favour Wiese-

n Rom. ii. 7; 1 Cor. xv. 42, 50, 53, 54; 2 Tim. i. 16; (Tit. ii. 7 var. read.).

πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ. 24. ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἀγαπώντων τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν ἐν [n] ἀφθαρσίᾳ.[1]

[1] Add αμην אᵃDEKLP, etc., Vulg., Syr., Copt., Goth., Eth., Thdrt., Victorin., Ambrst.; om. αμην א*ABFG 17, 73, f, g, Arm., Euth., Orig.

ler's notion that in the ἀδελφοῖς *Jewish* Christians are saluted, while the πάντων in ver. 24 refers to *Gentile* Christians. εἰρήνη, not = *concord* one with another, but = the OT שָׁלוֹם in salutations or farewells, = "may it be well with the brethren"; with the Christian connotation, however, of well-being as mental peace and good due to reconciliation with God. In his expression of what he would have them enjoy he couples with the blessing of a new mental peace that also of *love*—the Christian grace of love, that is to say, and such love as is *associated* with faith (μετὰ πίστεως). μετά, as distinguished from σύν, expresses the simple idea of *accompanying*. So here it is not "love *and* faith," but, faith being presupposed as making the Christian, it is love which *goes with* faith, not the *Divine* love (Beng., etc.), but the *brotherly* love which shows itself where *faith* is and by which faith works (Gal. v. 6).—ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ: *from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.* The two-fold source of the blessings desired for the reader—God as *Father*, the Father of Christ Himself, the *causa principalis* and *fons primarius;* Christ as *Lord*, Head over all with a sovereignty which is founded in God (1 Cor. xi. 3; Phil. ii. 9; Eph. i. 17), as *causa medians* and *fons secundarius*. The phrase occurs again (though with some variations in the readings) in 2 Tim. i. 2; Tit. i. 4. In the opening salutation it is "God *our* Father". Here the relation of God to *Christ* is more in view, in respect of their joint-bestowal of spiritual blessings.

Ver. 24. ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἀγαπώντων τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ. [ἀμήν]: *Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in uncorruptness.* As in Colossians, the three Pastoral Epistles, and also in Hebrews, we have here ἡ χάρις, "*the* grace," the grace beside which there is none other, the grace of God in Christ of which Christians have experience. In the closing benedictions of Cor., Gal., Philip., Thess., Philem. (as also in Rev.), we have the fuller form ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, or ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; also in Romans according to the TR, the verse, however, being deleted by the best critics. The former benediction was for the *brethren*, probably those in the Asiatic Churches. This second benediction is of widest scope—for *all* those who love Christ. The difficulty is with the unusual expression ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ, both as to its sense and its connection. The noun ἀφθαρσία is used in Plutarch of τὸ θεῖον (*Arist.*, c. 6), in Philo of the κόσμος (*De incorr. Mundi*, § 11), in the LXX and the Apocr. of *immortality* (Wisd. ii. 23, vi. 19; 4 Macc. xvii. 12). In the NT it is found, in addition to the present passage, in Rom. ii. 7 of the "incorruption" which goes with the *glory* and *honour* of the future; in 1 Cor. xv. 42, 50, 53, 54, of the "incorruption" of the resurrection-body; in 2 Tim. i. 10, of the life and "incorruption" brought to light by Christ. The occurrence in Tit. ii. 10 must be discounted in view of the adverse diplomatic evidence. The Pauline use, therefore, is in favour of the idea of "incorruption," "imperishableness," the quality of the *changeless* and *undecaying;* and that as belonging to the future in contrast with the present condition of things. There is nothing, therefore, to bear out the sense of *sincerity* adopted by Chrys., the AV, the Bish.; *cf.* Tynd., "in pureness"; Cov. Test., "sincerely"; Cov. Cran., "unfeignedly". This would be expressed by ἀφθορία or some similar term (*cf.* Tit. ii. 7). Nor can it be simply identified with all *imperishable being* in this life or in the other (Bleek, Olsh., Matthies, etc.); nor yet again with ἐν ἀφθάρτοις on the analogy of ἐν ἐπουρανίοις, as if it described the *sphere* of the ἀγάπη. There remains the *qualitative* sense of "imperishableness" (Mey., Ell., Alf., Abb., and most), which best suits linguistic use, the sense of the adj. ἄφθαρτος (*cf.* Rom. i. 23; 1 Cor. ix. 25, xv. 52; 1 Tim. i. 17; 1 Pet. i. 4, 23, iii. 4), and the application here in connection with the grace of love. The ἐν, therefore, is not to be loosely dealt with, as if = εἰς (Beza, as if it meant the same as εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα), or διά (Theophy.), or ὑπέρ (Chrys.), or even μετά (Theodor.); but has its proper force of the *element* or

manner in which the love is cherished. Further, the simplest and most obvious connection is with the **ἀγαπώντων**, as it is taken by most, including Chrys., Theod., and the other Greek commentators. Some, however, connect the phrase with **ἡ χάρις**, as = "grace be with all *in eternity*" (Bez., Beng., Matthies), or, "*in all imperishable being*" (Harl.), or as a short way of saying "grace be with all that they may have eternal life" (Olsh.). This construction, though strongly advocated recently by Von Soden, fails to give a clear and satisfactory sense, or one wholly accordant with the use of **ἀφθαρσία**; while there is against it also the fact that the defined noun and the defining phrase would be further apart than is usual in benedictions. Still less reason is there to connect the phrase immediately with **τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν** as if it described Christ as *immortal* (Wetst., etc.)—a construction both linguistically and grammatically (in the absence of **τὸν** before **ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ**) questionable. The phrase, therefore, defines the *way* in which they love, or the element in which their love has its being. It is a love that "knows neither change, diminution, nor decay" (Ell.). The closing **ἀμήν** added by the TR is found in ℵ^{3}D KPL, most cursives, Syr., Boh., etc.; but not in Bℵ*AG, 17, Arm., etc. It is omitted by LTTrWHRV.

The subscription **πρὸς Ἐφεσίους ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ῥώμης διὰ Τυχικοῦ** is omitted by LTWH; while Treg. gives simply **πρὸς Ἐφεσίους.** Like the subscriptions appended to Rom., Phil., and 2 Tim., it chronicles a view of the Epistle that is easier to reconcile with fact than is the case with others (1 and 2 Thess., Tit., and espec. 1 Cor., Gal., 1 Tim.). In the oldest MSS. it is simply **πρὸς Ἐφεσίους.** In the Versions, later MSS., and some of the Fathers it takes various longer forms. The form represented in the TR and the AV is not older than Euthalius, Deacon of Alexandria and Bishop of Sulca, who flourished perhaps in the middle of the fifth century.

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO THE

PHILIPPIANS

INTRODUCTION.

The Church Addressed. The town of Philippi occupied a commanding situation on the rocky slopes of a steep hill which overlooked, on the one side, the spacious plain of Drama watered by the Gangites (or Angites, Herodot., vii., 113), and, on the other, the pass between Mount Pangæum (south-west of Philippi) and the spurs of Hæmus. Through this pass ran the famous Roman road, the *Via Egnatia* (see Tafel, *De Via Militari Romanorum Egnatia*, Tübing., 1842), connecting Dyrrhachium on the Adriatic with the Hellespont. Its importance as a strategic position was manifest. Its value as a commercial centre was no less evident, standing as it did on the busy Roman thoroughfare which joined East and West, and being itself the emporium of a large industry which circled about the rich gold mines dotted over the surrounding region. Originally it had borne the name of Κρηνίδες (or αἱ Κρηνίδες), derived, perhaps, from the copious streams which flowed through the plain (Strabo, vii., *Frag.* 34, ταῖς Κρηνίσιν ὅπου νῦν οἱ Φίλιπποι πόλις ἵδρυται; Appian, *B. C.*, iv., 105, οἱ δὲ Φίλιπποι πόλις ἐστὶν ἣ Δάτος ὠνομάζετο πάλαι καὶ Κρηνίδες ἔτι πρὸ Δάτου). Philip of Macedon, in his victorious career, quickly discerned the value of the country bordering on Mount Pangæum. He recognised a source of vast profit in the gold and silver mines, which, up till now, had only been partially exploited. But a local centre of influence was necessary to command this coveted territory. Accordingly, by enlarging the former Krenides, he founded a new city, to which he gave his own name, Philippi (see Diod. Sic., xvi., 8, 6, ταύτην μὲν ἐπαυξήσας οἰκητόρων πλήθει μετωνόμασε Φιλίππους ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ προσαγορέυσας· τὰ δὲ κατὰ τὴν χώραν χρυσεῖα μέταλλα παντελῶς ὄντα λιτὰ καὶ ἄδοξα ταῖς κατασκευαῖς ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ηὔξησεν ὥστε δύνασθαι φέρειν αὐτῷ πρόσοδον πλεῖον ἢ ταλάντων χιλίων).

This Greek city attracted the notice of Augustus after his defeat of Brutus and Cassius in its immediate neighbourhood in 42 B.C. Having to find places of settlement for Italian soldiers who had served their time and could not be maintained in Italy, he established at Philippi, among other towns, a Roman colony, to which he granted

the *jus Italicum* as an attraction to settlers. This privilege included (*a*) exemption from the oversight of the provincial governor, (*b*) immunity from the poll and property taxes, (*c*) rights to property in the soil regulated by Roman law (see Marquardt-Mommsen, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, Bd. I., pp. 363-364; Mommsen, *Provinces of Roman Empire*, i., pp. 299-302).

But, in addition to its industrial and military importance, Philippi could boast of the religious zeal of its inhabitants. MM. Heuzey and Daumet, in their exhaustive and invaluable *Mission Archéologique de Macédoine* (Paris, 1876), have pointed out that the rocks near the ancient site of Philippi are "a veritable museum of mythology" (p. 86). Traces have been found of a temple dedicated to Silvanus, one of the most popular deities of the Imperial epoch, who was worshipped as the sacred guardian of the Emperor (pp. iii, 75). The Oriental god Mên seems also to have had his votaries there, and in the neighbouring mountains Dionysus, the favourite divinity of the Thracians, had "the most revered of his sanctuaries" (p. v). This was the spiritual soil upon which the Gospel of Christ had to work, a picture in miniature of the strangely cosmopolitan character of religion in the Roman Empire at that stage in its history. We can easily conceive how, amidst these surroundings, the maiden "possessing a spirit of divination" was sure to drive a flourishing trade.

The account of Paul's work at Philippi is given in Acts xvi., a chapter belonging, in part, to the "we-sections," which are regarded as extremely valuable even by the most negative critics. (For attacks upon the authenticity of this account see Knowling on A. xvi., *ad fin.*, in vol. ii. of this work.) It was thoroughly in accordance with the Apostle's well-weighed plan of operations to choose as the starting-point of his labours in Europe a typical city of the Roman Empire, lying on one of the main trade-routes, where he might count upon protection against violence, and from which any strong influence he might exert must extend itself towards East and West (see Ramsay, *Church in Rom. Emp.*, pp. 56, 70, 148 *et al.*). Paul seems to have attached himself to a little company of Jews and proselytes (A. xvi. 13 ff.). Mention is only made of some women who assembled for prayer by the river side on the Sabbath day. From this it may probably be gathered that Judaism had no firm hold at Philippi. It is worthy of note that the charge of being Jews is set in the forefront by the enraged Philippians who drag Paul and Silas before the Praetors.[1] (For the ancient hatred of

[1] See Henle, *Tüb. Theol. Quartal-Schr.*, 1893, Hft. 1, p. 82.

Jews in the Roman world, see esp. Reinach, *Textes . . . relatifs au Judaïsme*, Paris, 1895.) Lydia, a seller of purple dyed garments, a native of Thyatira, famous for its dyeing trade, became the nucleus of a Christian congregation. She was already a God-fearer (σεβομένη τὸν Θεόν, see Schürer, *Jewish People*, ii., 2, p. 314). As the result of Paul's preaching she and her household were baptised, and the Apostle, with his companions, accepted her hospitality (see esp. A. xvi. 15). This spirit of generosity was to become characteristic of the Church at Philippi and of early Christian life as a whole.

It is needless to dwell on the sharp crisis through which Paul and Silas had to pass. The arrest, the illegal flogging (*cf.* Cic., *in Verr.*, v., 66: *facinus est vinciri civem Romanum, scelus verberari, prope parricidium necari*), the extraordinary deliverance, the repentance, conversion and baptism of the jailor, the release in presence of the panic-stricken magistrates,—all these experiences must have made a deep impression on the minds of the Philippians. Already there were brethren there (A. xvi. 40), whom they exhorted as they were on the point of leaving Philippi for Thessalonica. Strangely enough, the "*we*" introduced at A. xvi. 10 ceases with ch. xvi., only to be resumed at ch. xx. 6, when Paul leaves Philippi after another visit. Perhaps it is not unreasonable to believe with Ramsay (*St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 219) that Luke was left behind at Philippi to extend and consolidate the good work which had been done. In any case the Church must have made rapid progress. For Paul had scarcely left Macedonia when the Philippian Christians began to minister to his needs. From that time onwards they occupy a chief place in his affections.

It is difficult to point to anything like fixed data as regards the *component parts* of the Church at Philippi. Schinz in his important dissertation, *Die christliche Gemeinde zu Philippi* (Zürich, 1837), brings forward many arguments to prove that it was essentially a heathen-Christian community (see esp. p. 57 ff.). Certainly much, both in the Epistle and in the narrative of its founding, goes to confirm this opinion. As we have seen, it was a proselyte, a woman of Asiatic birth, who took the leading place in the early fortunes of this Church. Jews seem to have been a negligeable quantity at Philippi, for, apparently, there was no synagogue in the town. From the evidence of the Epistle, devoted women of heathen extraction (as their names show, see ch. iv. 2) stood in the forefront of Christian work. This was not peculiar to Philippi. Nothing is more remarkable than the place taken by women in the Apostolic Church as a whole. The Christian faith was their true emancipation. It gave scope for their most characteristic activities (see an interesting sum-

mary in Rilliet, *Commentaire sur l'Épître . . . aux Phil.*, pp. 312-313; also Renan, *St. Paul*, pp. 147-150; Lft., *Philippians*, pp. 55-56, who hints with good reason, on the evidence of Inscrr., that women occupied a specially favourable position in Macedonia; H. Achelis, *Zeitsch. f. N. T. Wissensch.*, i., 2, pp. 93, 97-98, and *cf.* notes on ch. iv. 2). It is worthy of notice that the only *definite* information we have as to any friction in the Philippian Church attaches itself to two of these Christian matrons, Euodia and Syntyche. In all likelihood the friction was slight. The Apostle does not deal with it in strong terms. Evidently it was some personal variance connected with Church life and work, or, perhaps, associated with the possession of particular spiritual gifts. We know how this latter endangered unity at Corinth (see 1 C. xii.). It is possible that we have a hint of its character in the warnings given against a false self-satisfaction in ch. iii. 12-16. Here and there, throughout the Epistle, there are echoes of it (see ch. i. 27, ii. 2-4, 14, iv. 5), and these point to a certain danger of selfish assumptions of superiority. But there are no traces of doctrinal controversies like those which rent some of the other Pauline Churches. On the whole, Paul feels unmingled satisfaction and joy in their condition. It is evident, therefore, that if there were any Jewish-Christians in the Church, they had not made themselves obnoxious by laying special emphasis on the characteristic tenets of their party. Indirect evidence on this point is afforded by incidental statements in the Epistle. Paul was accustomed to accept gifts from the Philippians. This was a course which he took care to avoid in Churches where a minority of Jewish-Christians could bring it up as a reproach against him. (Contrast his attitude, *e.g.*, towards the Church at Corinth.) Further, when he does burst forth in words of solemn warning against his adversaries (ch. iii. 2), it may be clearly seen that he is dealing with persons entirely outside the Philippian Church, but persons who may at any moment intrude into their midst and work serious havoc (see notes *ad loc.*). It seems, therefore, reasonable to conclude that this Church was composed mainly (if not exclusively) of heathen-Christians, at one in their loyalty to the Faith and to him who had first proclaimed it in their hearing; exposed, at the same time, to hurtful influences which might invade them from outside, and liable to those mutual differences of feeling which make themselves manifest in every Christian community.

The Occasion of the Letter. In ancient times letters were written to correspondents at a distance when a favourable opportunity presented itself of forwarding them to their destination (*cf.* Cic., *ad Attic.*, i., 9, 1). In the present instance this was afforded by the

return of Epaphroditus to Philippi (ch. ii. 28). From ch. iv. 15-16 it may be inferred that Paul had frequent communications with the Philippians.[1] The letter before us is evidently the reply to one which Paul had received. The recognition of this gives the proper clue to its interpretation. Dr. Rendel Harris, in a suggestive paper in the *Expositor* (v., 8, p. 403), advances the hypothesis that "when Paul replied to a letter he held the letter that he was replying to in his hand, and followed closely the points in it that needed attention" (see also Lock, *ibid.*, v., 6, p. 65 ff.). We believe this to be, in large measure, true of *Philippians*. Traces of a definite reply seem to emerge at i. 12 (where he answers their eager inquiries as to his health and prospects), i. 26 (they had probably spoken of him as their καύχημα, *cf.* Harris, *op. cit.*, p. 178), ii. 19 (where he reminds them that he is as much concerned to hear good news as they are), ii. 26 (their reference to the illness of Epaphroditus), iii. 2 (the abruptness with which the warning is introduced is best explained by some disconcerting tidings from Philippi), iv. 10 (they had apologised for their remissness in attending to his wants), and perhaps iv. 14-15 (they may have felt a little doubtful whether Paul would be willing to accept their gift, for here and there in the Epistle we have the *slightest* hints that he has to disabuse them of a notion that he had not been entirely pleased with them. See notes on i. 3).

It is manifest that the Apostle had received a gift from the Philippian Church through Epaphroditus, who spent some time, at least, in his company at Rome (ch. ii. 30). We cannot tell whether a letter had accompanied this gift, or, if so, whether Paul had acknowledged it in any way before. At all events, our Epistle is written considerably later, and presupposes a communication which came to Rome from Philippi while Epaphroditus was still at Paul's service. This is necessary from ch. ii. 26, ἀδημονῶν διότι ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἠσθένησεν. Perhaps even the order of subjects in the Letter is regulated by the arrangement of topics in that from Philippi. The chief matter involved, the acknowledgment of their gift, is introduced at the beginning (ch. i. 3-5, this is at least a likely interpretation) and end (ch. iv. 10-19) with a graciousness and delicacy of feeling unsurpassed in the annals of letter-writing.

Place and Date of Writing. (*a*) It is all but universally agreed that this Epistle was written from Rome. That is the early

[1] No argument, however, can be based on the fact that Polycarp, *Ep. ad Philipp.*, iii., says of Paul: ὃς καὶ ἀπὼν ὑμῖν ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολάς, as the plural is frequently used to describe a single letter. See Lft. *ad loc.*

tradition, and no contrary evidence has been forthcoming strong enough to refute it. Of course the matter must be determined by comparing what we gather concerning Paul's circumstances from the Epistle itself with our information from other sources. The Apostle is a prisoner. He is residing in some centre of activity where the preaching of Christ has extended with amazing rapidity. His trial is about to reach a critical point. There is still the possibility that he may have to suffer as a martyr. But, on the whole, his outlook is very hopeful, and he can speak with joyful confidence of the speedy prospect of seeing his friends at Philippi again. Incidentally he mentions that the real character of his offence is now known in the "Prætorium," and he concludes his letter by sending greetings from the Christians of Cæsar's household. It seems to us that this situation can only correspond to one particular epoch in the Apostle's history, that the beginning of which is outlined in A. xxviii. 16, 30-31. The only alternative hypothesis which has ever been seriously put forward is that of *Cæsarea*. This was first done by H. G. Paulus (in a *Programm*, Jena, 1799), and later, more acutely, by Böttger (*Beiträge*, ii., p. 47 ff., Gött., 1837). Böttger lays stress on the point that prisoners at Rome could not have experienced the delay which is presupposed in this Epistle in the case of Paul. This argument is invalidated by the fact that processes of appeal were peculiarly subject to protracted delays. These were caused in particular by the necessity of having all the declarations of witnesses, informations, etc., handed in writing to the appellant before the higher court heard the appeal (see Geib, *Geschichte d. röm. Criminalprocesses*, esp. pp. 688-690). Böttger also tries to show that πραιτώριον (ch. i. 13) and οἰκία Καίσαρος (ch. iv. 22), almost the only local references in the Epistle, apply equally well to Cæsarea. This argument is emphasised by O. Holtzmann (*Th. LZ.*, 1890, col. 177), who adds these others, (*a*) that we know nothing of a sojourn of Timothy at Rome, (*b*) that the bitterness against the Judaisers is far more intelligible on the supposition that Paul's experiences of the Jews at Jerusalem were fresh in his remembrance. No one would deny that πραιτώριον is used of an Imperial residence outside Rome. And possibly οἰκία Καίσαρος might be equivalent to πραιτώριον, *i.e.*, in this case, according to Holtzmann, τὸ πραιτώριον τοῦ Ἡρώδου (A. xxiii. 35). This supposition Holtzmann believes to be the best explanation of μάλιστα (ch. iv. 22), for he considers the use of that word to point to those in Paul's immediate neighbourhood. But the assumption is quite gratuitous. He has already sent greetings from οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ ἀδελφοί, and in adding those of the ἅγιοι he singles out οἱ ἐκ τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας. This was

most natural, since we know from other sources (see notes *ad loc.*) that there was a large body of Christians in the Imperial household, some of them perhaps connected with Philippi, and, in all probability, this movement had assumed greater proportions during Paul's sojourn at Rome. His converts there, in their new-born enthusiasm, would be likely to show a peculiarly lively interest in that far-distant Church which had manifested so remarkable an appreciation of their father in the Faith. An unbiased reader must feel that there is something far-fetched in the reference of οἰκία Καίσαρος to Cæsarea. The context of πραιτώριον indicates that Paul writes from a centre of eager Christian activity, a place of much higher importance than Cæsarea, which had long since heard the Gospel (A. x.), and could scarcely, in any case, be supposed to exert a pre-eminent influence. As to the other arguments of Holtzmann, there is nothing to oppose the hypothesis that Timothy visited Rome; in fact, it would be surprising if he had never seen his beloved master during so long a period of suspense. And certainly it did not require any *recent* experiences of Paul to call forth stern denunciations of those Judaisers who had dogged his steps from the beginning to the close of his career.

But the decisive argument for Rome, in our judgment, is Paul's *situation*. He expects a speedy termination of his case. How could this be possible at Cæsarea? There, on the first favourable opportunity that presents itself, he appeals to Cæsar. Only when that appeal has been heard can any decision be come to. And many hints in the Epistle suggest that the all-important moment was close at hand (see ch. i. 12, 13, 19, 20, 26, ii. 24, probably i. 7; also a discussion by the author in *Expository Times*, x., 1, pp. 22-24, and an excellent dissertation, *The Epistle of St. Paul's First Trial*, by R. R. Smith, Camb., 1899). It is perhaps needless to deal with Spitta's argument in favour of Cæsarea (*Apostelgeschichte*, p. 281) that the expectation of Felix that he should be offered a bribe by Paul was roused by the gift of money which the Apostle had lately received from Philippi.

(*b*) We believe that the arguments adduced above are sufficient to fix Rome as the *place* from which the Epistle was written. They also suggest a *late date* in Paul's sojourn at Rome, for he is awaiting the final decision in his trial. Lightfoot has attempted to show that *Philippians* stands first in order among the Imprisonment-Epistles. His main argument is greater similarity (especially in thought) to *Romans* than to *Colossians* and *Ephesians*. But this method of reasoning is precarious. Are we at liberty to break up the thinking of a man like the Apostle Paul, as it is

expressed in a small group of occasional letters, into a series of well-marked stages? These letters were, after all, the products of special circumstances, of special situations. Paul did not write as one who gradually, in successive works, presents a system of thought to the world. We may readily admit that more parallels may be found, on careful search, between *Philippians* and *Romans* than between it and the other Imprisonment-Epistles (although this statement must be made with caution, see Von Soden, *Hand-Comm.*, iii., 1, p. 16, on the marked resemblances between *Phil.* and *Coloss.*). But that does not touch the question of date. Paul's letters must be interpreted from the historical background of each of them. To use as an argument for the ante-dating of *Philippians* the fact that the other two letters of the Captivity "exhibit an advanced stage in the development of the Church" (Lft., *Phil.*, p. 45) seems, to say the least, hazardous, when, on Lightfoot's own showing, no more than a year can have elapsed between the earlier and the later writings. The "advanced stage in the development of the Church" emerges suddenly in view of the dangerous situation in which the Christians of Asia were placed at the time.

It is more difficult to speak with any confidence as to the actual date. The chronology of Paul's life has recently been the subject of keen discussion. For our purpose the crucial date is that of the arrival of Festus as Procurator of Judæa. Everything depends on determining the year in which the Procurator Felix was recalled and replaced by Festus (see Harnack, *Chronologie d. altchristl. Litt.*, p. 233). It is impossible here even to give a sketch of the various lines of argument used to fix approximately the all-important date. O. Holtzmann, who depends upon the authority of Tacitus and Josephus, and is followed, among others, by Harnack (who emphasises, in addition, the testimony of the *Chronicle* of Eusebius), argues for the end of the year 55 or the early part of 56. This would make 57 the year of Paul's arrival in Rome, and thus, if our former arguments are valid, *Philippians* would have to be assigned to the year 59, as he approached the close of his two years' captivity at Rome. This dating is much earlier than the received chronology, which would refer the recall of Felix to 60 and the Apostle's arrival in Rome to 61. In that case our Epistle would fall somewhere within the year 63. We are inclined, however, to accept the view of Mr. C. H. Turner in his masterly article on the *Chronology of N. T.* in Hastings' *Bible Dict.* After a fair-minded and cautious survey of all the arguments, he is led to adopt 58 as the year of the recall of Felix and the arrival of Festus in the province of Judæa. Paul would thus have reached

Rome early in 59. Hence, in all likelihood, *Philippians* was written towards the close of the year 61, when matters had taken so favourable a turn that the Apostle could reasonably expect a speedy release (see Turner's article, *op. cit.*). For the new chronology see O. Holtzmann, *N. T. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 125 ff., Harnack, *Chronologie*, p. 233 ff.; for the received view, Schürer, *Jewish People*, i., 2, pp. 182-184, and note 38 with exhaustive list of literature, and in *Zeitsch. f. wiss. Th.*, Bd. xli., Hft. 1, pp. 21-42. On the whole question of place and date consult Steinmetz, *Die zweite röm. Gefangenschaft d. Ap. Paulus*, Leipz., 1897, pp. 4-9, and especially Th. Zahn, *Einleit. in d. N. T.*, Bd. I., pp. 380-392, whose arguments appear quite conclusive for placing *Phil.* after *Eph.*, *Col.* and *Philem.*

Genuineness. (*a*) There is no lack of *external* evidence for this Epistle. References are found to it in Church writers from the earliest times. These begin with Polycarp (πρὸς Φιλ., iii., 10 [Παῦλος] . . . ὃς καὶ ἀπὼν ὑμῖν ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολάς), and include the ancient letter from the Christians of Vienne and Lyons (Eusebius, *H. E.*, v., 2), as well as the *Fragment* of Muratori on the Canon.

(*b*) The *internal* testimony is equally convincing. Perhaps no Pauline epistle bears more conclusively the stamp of authenticity. There is an artlessness, a delicacy of feeling, a frank outpouring of the heart which could not be simulated. Like 2 Corinthians, this letter is a mirror of the Apostle's personal life. It reflects his varying moods at a great crisis in his history. It throbs from first to last with eager emotion. It gives a most vivid picture of Paul's intimate relations with the Churches which he has founded. The whole composition of the letter is devoid of any artificial plan. The Apostle moves from subject to subject by rapid transitions and unexpected turns of thought. If this Epistle betrays the compiler's hand, no internal proof of authenticity may be held valid at all, and literary criticism becomes irrelevant. For, in the case before us, every circumstance can be understood from the conditions existing in the life and times of Paul. This is the problem with which criticism has always and alone to deal.

None the less has the genuineness of *Philippians* been stoutly challenged. Baur was the first to enter the field in his *Paulus*, Bd. II., p. 50 ff. The objections he raised were: (1) the echo of Gnostic ideas in ch. ii. 6-9, (2) the lack of a genuine Pauline content, (3) the extraordinary nature of some of the historical details. To a sober judgment these difficulties do not exist. The Gnosticism of ch. ii. is the phantasy of a biased imagination. If the content in this Epistle be not Pauline, we may be said to know nothing of the Apostle's

thoughts or feelings. The historical details, so far from being extraordinary or unaccountable, afford us some of the most valuable sidelights we possess on a particular epoch of Paul's history, otherwise obscure. Since Baur's time comparatively few critics have been bold enough to renew the attack on our Epistle. A complete history of its criticism will be found in Holsten's articles in the *Jahrb. f. protestant. Theol.* (1876), pp. 328-372. No more searching scrutiny of the Epistle with a view to proving its spuriousness has ever been carried out than that of Holsten himself (*op. cit.*, 1875, p. 425 ff.; 1876, p. 58 ff.). In these discussions he brings all his well-known acuteness and subtlety of reasoning to bear upon the minutest points of the letter. He willingly admits that it belongs to the Pauline school, but decides from such indications as the method of dealing with the Judaisers in ch. i., the conception of Christ in ch. ii. 6-9, etc., etc., that it cannot be the work of Paul. But any fair-minded reader of Holsten's articles will feel bound to agree with the verdict of an unbiased scholar like Schürer that his "arguments are so foolish that one is sometimes tempted to put them down as slips of the pen" (*Th. LZ.*, 1880, col. 555). Probably Pfleiderer's statement may be taken as representative of present-day opinion: "The genuineness of this letter is not to be doubted. The accounts of *Philippians* tally thoroughly with the presuppositions of *Romans*" (*Urchristenthum*, p. 153). Among many elaborate defences of the authenticity of *Phil.* we may mention as especially worthy of note those of Hilgenfeld in *Zeitsch. f. wiss. Theol.*, xvi., 2, p. 178 ff.; xviii., 4, p. 566 ff.; xx., 2, p. 145 ff.; xxvii., 4, p. 498 ff.

The *unity* of the Epistle has also been questioned. This was done as early as the beginning of last century by Heinrichs (*N. T.*, ed. J. Koppe, vol. vii., pars 2, proll., p. 31 ff.), who supposed it to consist of two letters, one (ch. i. 1-iii. 1; iv. 21-23) being addressed to the Church in general, the other (ch. iii. 2-iv. 20) to the more prominent authorities in it. (For a full account of such attempts see Clemen, *Einheitlichkeit d. paulin. Briefe*, 1894, p. 133 ff.) Völter (*Theol. Tijdschr.*, 1892, pp. 10-44, 117-146) put forward the theory that we have here a genuine Epistle consisting of ch. i. 1-7, 12-14, 18^{b}-26; ii. 17-29; iv. 10-21, 23, and also a spurious one made up of ch. i. 8-10, 27-30; ii. 1-16; iii. 1^{b}-iv. 9, 22, the remaining verses being added by the redactor whose compilation is before us. It is difficult to take so arbitrary a scheme as this seriously, and Völter entirely fails to show what aim or motive his hypothetical redactor had in his work. This would require to be stated with some appearance of reason before we could consider the likelihood of finding in a simple,

apparently spontaneous letter, a document so complicated as that which Völter discovers. C. Clemen, in the work above cited and also in his *Chronologie d. paulin. Briefe,* 1893, attempts to prove that two genuine letters have been combined in one Epistle. The first, composed of ch. ii. 19-24; iii.; iv. 8-9, he holds to be the earliest of the Captivity Epistles, the second, embracing ch. i. 1-ii. 18, 25-30; iv. 1-7, 10-23, to be the latest (see Table in *Chronol.,* p. 292). While laying stress upon the presence of numerous repetitions and paragraphs which have no connexion with their context, he bases his position mainly on what he conceives to be inexplicable contradictions between ch. ii. 20 and ch. i. 14, 16, and also between ch. iii. 2, 18 and ch. i. 18, 28. The theory, at first sight, is certainly plausible. There is no *a priori* reason (*cf.* the case of Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians) why two letters or fragments of letters to the Philippians should not, by some accidental circumstances of which we know nothing, have been combined. Only there must be some strong basis for such an hypothesis, derivable from the Epistle itself. We cannot feel that such a basis is presented by the arguments briefly alluded to above. In the groups of passages brought forward the contradiction appears to us imaginary. An exegesis which takes careful account of the historical background of the Epistle and recognises that the Apostle, like other men, had his moods of strong feeling, leaves no ground for maintaining that his statements in the one group are irreconcilable with those in the other[1] (see, for the details, the notes on these passages, and a most interesting parallel drawn from the criticism of Cicero's *Letters* in Deissmann, *Bibelstudien,* pp. 220-222, 250).

Special Characteristics. The perusal of the Epistle cannot fail to produce the impression of *artlessness.* That is another way of saying that it precisely fulfils the conditions of a letter. Had this most prominent characteristic been always kept in view, much futile theorising both in the exegesis and in the criticism of the Epistle would have been avoided. The only plausible objections that have been brought against its genuineness or integrity would have been recognised as the natural consequences of its epistolary character (*Brieflichkeit,* a more convenient expression than English affords). For here, as in all his letters, the Apostle speaks for the occasion. He pictures his Christian brethren at Philippi as listening to his conversation. All is spontaneous and free. He draws up no fixed scheme which has to be followed, although, perhaps, the letter (or

[1] Clemen has recently withdrawn his objections to the unity of *Philippians* (see *Th. LZ.,* 1901, col. 293).

letters) from the Philippian Church may in some degree have suggested the course which his thought pursues. He feels thoroughly at home with his readers. Thoughts crowd in upon him as he writes. His reminiscences of Philippi supply secret links of connexion between paragraphs which might seem isolated from one another, links of connexion which we can no longer trace. Many of his ideas he does not require to elaborate. A brief hint will bring his readers into touch with the Apostle's mind.

It is quite plain, from a comparison of this with his other letters, that no Church held a deeper place in Paul's *affection*. This may be accounted for in various ways. Evidently the Judaising section of the Church had not, as yet, been able to gain a footing at Philippi, although there is little doubt that attempts must have been made. The Christians there refused to lend their ears to insinuations against their well-tried teacher and friend. They believed in the Gospel as Paul had presented it to them. This unflinching loyalty of theirs would be a genuine consolation to the Apostle amidst so many disheartening experiences endured through the fickleness of once promising converts. No wonder that he calls them his joy and crown.[1]

But, besides, there was, in all likelihood, a certain frank openheartedness, an affectionate simplicity of nature, which appealed directly to the mind of Paul. The Macedonians, as a people, had preserved the manners of a more artless time. They had suffered comparatively little from the corruption of an enervating age. They had maintained, perhaps, above all other parts of Greece, a healthy tone of life, a sturdy morality (*cf.* Renan, *St. Paul*, pp. 136-139). When the Gospel came to them they received it with a child-like responsiveness. And their appreciation of its worth remained no mere empty feeling. It took practical shape. No sooner had Paul left Philippi than they began to consider his needs and, with unhesitating generosity, to minister to them (see ch. iv. 15-16). And when the Apostle made his great collection for the poorer Christians at Jerusalem, the Churches of Macedonia amazed him by their liberality. It was natural that Paul should be drawn into a specially cordial intimacy with such a people. He had proved their loyalty; he had received numerous tokens of their affection. A man of his open and enthusiastic temperament would rejoice to find a Church to which he could unveil his heart without any doubts or misgivings.

The undertone of the Epistle is a deep, restrained joy. This springs partly from his unalloyed satisfaction in the Christians

[1] On *fidelity* as characteristic of the Macedonian people see an interesting note in Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, p. 248, note 5.

at Philippi. All that he has experienced at their hands, all that he has heard of them by report, calls forth from him nothing but thankfulness. Even any word of warning which he may feel to be needful is uttered with the most delicate courtesy and tact. But further, his *mood* at the time of writing is cheerful and bright. He is a prisoner, but, none the less, the work of Christ has richly prospered. He has discovered that it is altogether independent of the human agents employed. Hence, although enmity or opposition may silence the preacher, the Gospel has free course. It remains the power of God unto salvation. But the progress of events, also, has led him to believe that his work is not done. Things seem to be shaping towards his release. The clouds, indeed, have not wholly vanished. Therefore a dark shadow flits, for a moment, across the page. But hope returns, a hope not baseless, but resting on what he feels to be the mind of God. So his farewell greeting can utter itself in exulting strains: "Rejoice in the Lord always, and again I say, Rejoice".

LITERATURE. (1) Earlier Commentaries. The most valuable are those of Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia (ed. H. B. Swete, Camb., 1880) and Theodoret; in the Reformation period, Calvin.

(2) Modern Works. Out of a large number which have been consulted we may mention Commentaries by Hoelemann (1839), Rilliet (1841), De Wette (ed. 2, 1847), Meyer (Engl. Tr.), Wiesinger (in Olshausen's *Com.*, Engl. Tr.), B. Weiss (1859, most exhaustive), J. C. von Hofmann, Alford, Ellicott, Lightfoot, Eadie, Beet, Moule (*Cambr. Bible; Cambr. Gr. Test.*), A. H. Franke (ed. 5 of Meyer, 1886), R. A. Lipsius (in Holtzmann's *Hand-Commentar*, 1892, admirable for terse exposition), A. Klöpper (1893, thorough), Gwynn (in *Speaker's Com.*, 1893), Wohlenberg (in Strack-Zoeckler's *Komm.*, 1895), B. Weiss (*Die paulin. Briefe im berichtigten Text*, 1896, brief notes), Vincent (*International Crit. Comm.*, 1897), E. Haupt (ed. 6 of Meyer, 1897, very suggestive), and K. J. Müller (Freib. i. Br., 1899).

Of a more homiletic or practical character are the works of Braune (in Lange's *Bibelwerk*), Vaughan (1882) and Von Soden (1889, a model of its kind). To the same category belong Rainy's exposition of the Epistle (*Expositor's Bible*, specially valuable on the theology), and Moule's *Philippian Studies* (1897, devotional). Bengel's *Gnomon* is always worth consulting.

Most valuable *articles* dealing with the Epistle are those of Holsten (*Jahrb. f. protestant. Theol.*, 1875, 1876, see section on "Genuineness" in the Introduction *supr.*), Zahn (Luthardt's *Zeitsch. f. kirchliche Wissensch. u. kirchl. Leben*, 1885) and Henle (*Tübingen*

Quartal-Schrift, 1893). See also the articles quoted in the Introduction.

Useful dissertations are those of Schinz, *Die christliche Gemeinde zu Philippi* (Zürich, 1833), Mynster, *Kleine theolog. Schriften*, p. 169 ff., Rettig, *Quaestiones Philippenses* (Giessen, 1831), Laurent, *Neutestamentliche Studien*, and R. R. Smith, *The Epistle of St. Paul's First Trial* (Cambr. 1899). For the literature on Phil. ii. 6-11 see the notes *ad loc.* A good list of discussions against and in favour of the genuineness of the Epistle will be found in the *Com.* of Lipsius, pp. 211-212. A very full and interesting examination of all matters of Introduction is presented in Zahn's *Einleitung in d. N. T.*, Bd. I., pp. 368-398.

On points of grammar and language, in addition to the ordinary grammatical works, frequent use has been made of Hatzidakis, *Einleitung in d. Neugriechische Grammatik* (Leipz., 1892), Viteau, *Études sur le Grec du N. T.* (I. *Le Verbe;* II. *Sujet, Complément et Attribut*), 2 vols. (Paris, 1893, 1896), W. Schmid, *Atticismus*, 5 vols. (Stuttgart, 1887-1897), and especially G. A. Deissmann, *Bibelstudien* (Marburg, 1895) and *Neue Bibelstudien* (Marb., 1897).

Quotations from LXX follow Swete's ed. For the critical notes, besides the great editions of the text, Weiss, *Textkritik d. paulin. Briefe* (Leipz., 1896), has been largely used.

The abbreviations used in the notes which may require explanation are :—

al. = other passages.
Alf. = Alford's *Greek Testament.*
Chr. = Chrysostom.
Comm. = Commentators.
CT. = *Cambridge Greek Testament.*
Dsm. = Deissmann (*BS.* = *Bibelstudien*, *NBS.* = *Neue Bibelstudien*).
Edd. = Editors.
Ell. = Ellicott.
esp. = especially.
Gw. = Gwynn.
Hatz., *Einl.* = Hatzidakis, *Einleitung in die Neugriech. Grammatik.*
Hfm. = Hofmann.
Hltzm. = Holtzmann.
Hpt. = Haupt.
Inscrr. = Inscriptions.
Kl. = Klöpper.
Lft. = Lightfoot.
Lips. = Lipsius.
MT. = *Moods and Tenses* (Burton, Goodwin).
Myr. = Meyer.
Pfl. = Pfleiderer.

Phil. = Epistle to the Philippians.
SH. = Sanday and Headlam (*Romans*).
SK. = *Studien und Kritiken.*
Thdrt. = Theodoret.
Th. LZ. = *Theologische Literaturzeitung.*
Th. Mps. = Theodore of Mopsuestia.
TK. = *Textkritik d. paulin. Briefe* (Weiss).
W-M. = Moulton's Ed. of Winer's *Grammar.*
W-Sch. = Schmiedel's Ed. of Winer.
Wohl. = Wohlenberg.
Ws. = Weiss.
Zw. Th. = *Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theologie.*

The recognised contractions have, as a rule, been used in the critical notes.

ΠΑΥΛΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΥ

Η ΠΡΟΣ

ΦΙΛΙΠΠΗΣΙΟΥΣ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ.[1]

I. 1. ΠΑΥΛΟΣ καὶ Τιμόθεος, [a] δοῦλοι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,[2] πᾶσι τοῖς [b] ἁγίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Φιλίπποις, σὺν[3] [c] ἐπισκόποις[4]

a Ps. cxvi. 16 and num. exx. Rom. i. 1; *cf.* 1 Thess. ii. 4. b *Cf.* 1 Cor. i. 2. c Acts xx. 28; 1 Pet. ii. 25; 1 Tim. iii. 2; Tit. i. 7; 2 Kings xi. 18; Neh. xi. 9.

[1] προς Φιλιππησιους: so ℵABK 1, 37 (-πισιους), 113. αρχεται προς Φ. DEFG (DE -πηνσιους). The title in T.R. comes from the ed. of Elzevir, without MS. authority.

[2] So FGKLP, syrr., Chr., Thdrt. Tisch., W.H., Ws. Χ. Ι. with ℵBDE, d, e, cop. Χ. Ι. more prob., as copyists were more likely to write the common expression Ι. Χ. for the other, which is characteristic of Paul (*cf.* Ws., *TK.*, pp. 131-134).

[3] Brückner (*Chronologische Reihenfolge d. paulin. Brr.*, Haarlem, 1890, p. 222) would omit the whole clause as interpolated.

[4] B²DᶜEK with Thphl., Cassiod. συνεπισκοποις; *coepiscopis* in Freising Fragg. of O.L. (ed. Ziegler). Th. Mps. apparently knows this reading, but rejects it (see Swete's ed., vol. i., p. 198).

Chapter I.—Vv. 1-2. Salutation.—Ver. 1. The only significance belonging to the mention of Timothy is that he was a well-known figure at Philippi (Acts xvi. 1-12, xix. 22, xx. 3-6), that they owed much to him, and that he was about to visit them again. The Epistle claims, of course, to be exclusively Paul's own.—**δοῦλοι.** Already in O.T. δ. is used in a distinctly religious sense; see esp. Psalms (LXX). As used by Paul, while expressing intense fervour of devotion, it includes the idea of a special calling and function in Christ's kingdom, parallel to its application in O.T. to the prophets; see Rom. i. 1, Gal. i. 10, also Tit. i. 1. There is genuine humility in the contrast between **δοῦλοι** and **ἁγίοις.** He only calls himself **ἀπόστολος** when he assumes a commanding mood (Chr. *ad loc.*).—**Χρ. Ἰ.** The order strikes the keynote of Paul's attitude towards his Master. He delights to think of Him in royal dignity, the Messiah who was once Jesus being now **Κύριος.** For a good discussion of the respective designations **Χ. Ἰ.** and **Ἰ. Χ.**, see Von Soden in *Abhandlungen C. von Weizsäcker gewidmet*, p. 118.—**πᾶσιν τ. ἁγίοις.** It is difficult to say whether **πᾶσιν** is emphatic or not. It is, at least, remarkable how often **πᾶς** appears in the opening paragraphs of this Epistle, as if to show Paul's strict impartiality, perhaps in the face of some pretensions to superiority which appeared in the Philippian Church. But, on the other hand, see 2 Cor. i. 1, Rom. i. 7, where the same phrase seems to have no special emphasis. —**τ. ἁγίοις.** Really a *terminus technicus* of the early Church. Having as its basis that idea of consecration to God, and consequent participation in His Divine majesty which bulks so largely in O.T. religion (*e.g.*, Lev. xi. 44-45, Jud. xiii. 7), and continues to have full prominence in the N.T. (Acts, almost all Epistles, Rev.), it suggests also in every N.T. instance that side of Christian life which stands in

καὶ [d] διακόνοις· 2. χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

[d] Almost confined to Esther in LXX. Technical use only here and 1 Tim. iii. 8, 12.

most glaring contrast with the impurity and sensuality of the Gentiles, holiness of heart and conduct. This would naturally come into view as the result of the working of the Holy Spirit; see McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 509 ff.; Hltzm., *N.T. Theol.*, ii., p. 152. The best commentary on the expression is John xvii. 11, 14, 15-23. In his salutations Paul uses the word as practically = **ἐκκλησία** (*cf.* 1 Cor. i. 2, 2 Cor. i. 1, with 1 Thess. i. 1). For the Christian Church is the spiritual successor of the sacred community of Israel. Ideally, all Christians are "saints," *cf.* **ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χ. Ἰ.** (1 Cor. i. 2). The Spirit is, of course, the Sanctifier, but He only deals with those who are in Christ Jesus.—**ἐν Χ. Ἰ.** These words sum up Paul's Christianity. They denote the most intimate living union that can be conceived between the soul of the believer and the Risen Lord. He, as Spirit, is the atmosphere in which the new life is lived. *Cf.* the Rabbinic use of מָקוֹם (place or space) as a name of God; see Taylor, *Sayings of Jewish Fathers*, 2nd ed., p. 39. The phrase occurs eight times in Phil. The same idea is expressed by **Χριστὸς ἐν ἐμοί**; see esp. Gal. ii. 20. "The gist of this formula **ἐν Χριστῷ** is nothing else than Paul's mystic faith, in which the believer gives up himself, his own life, to Christ, and possesses the life of Christ in himself: he in Christ, and Christ in him; he dead with Christ, and Christ become his life" (Pfl., *Paulinism*, E. Tr., i., p. 198). For the extraordinarily central place of the idea in Paul's teaching, see Deissmann, *Die Neutestamentliche Formel "in Christo Jesu"* (Marburg, 1892).—**σὺν ἐπισκόποις κ. διακόνοις.** These keenly-discussed terms can only be most briefly examined. Who were the **ἐπίσκ.**? In LXX almost always = an official in charge of work being done (*e.g.*, repairs in Temple; rebuilding of Jerusalem) or an officer in the army (much less frequently). In N.T., besides this passage, (*a*) Acts xx. 28, applied by Paul to the **πρεσβύτεροι** of Ephesus, whom the Holy Ghost has made **ἐπισκόπους ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ**; (*b*) 1 Pet. ii. 25, of Christ, who is called **τὸν ποιμένα καὶ ἐπίσκοπον τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν**; (*c*) 1 Tim. iii. 2 and Tit. i. 7, where it is almost universally admitted to be synonymous with **πρεσβύτερος**. Two points are clear from N.T. evidence: 1. The **ἐπίσκοπος** is, at least, often the same person as the **πρεσβύτερος**. 2. The **ἐπίσκ.** is concerned with shepherding the flock of God. Have we any information to corroborate these facts? As to the first there is the strong tradition of the early Church, *e.g.*, Jerome, *Ep.*, 69, 3: *apud veteres iidem episcopi et presbyteri*; there is the admitted fact that in 1 Clem. the name **πρεσβύτεροι** is given to the **ἐπίσκοποι**; and Tertullian (*Apologet.*, 39) designates the officials who preside over the congregation *probati quique seniores*; see esp. F. Loofs, *SK.*, 1890, pp. 639-641. The second fact mentioned above conflicts with the celebrated theory of Hatch and Harnack (who has, however, greatly modified his standpoint; see his important review of Loening's *Die Gemeindeverfassung des Urchristenthums* in *Th. LZ.*, 1889, coll. 418-429), that the **ἐπίσκοποι** were distinct finance and cultus officials, who only gradually came into possession of more spiritual functions. But it seems hazardous to narrow down the duties of the **ἐπίσκ.** No doubt the name may, in certain cases, have been suggested by that of the **ἐπίσκοπος** or (more commonly) **ἐπιμελητής**, who exercised administrative control over the property of private associations and guilds existing at that time in the Hellenic world and enforced the rules of such associations (see J. Réville, *Les Origines de l'Épiscopat*, Paris, 1894, pp. 160-163). But just as the functions of these persons were left comparatively vague and undefined, so we might expect to find the beginnings of local administration in the Christian Church still less clearly marked. An additional reason for this would lie in the pre-eminent authority of the Apostles and the high place assigned to the possessors of "gifts". Accordingly it appears wise to use great caution in making any distinction between **πρεσβυτ.** and **ἐπίσκ.** Probably the truth lies in the direction of regarding **πρεσβ.** as a title of *status*, while **ἐπίσκ.** is one of *function*. Probably all **ἐπίσκοποι** were **πρεσβύτεροι**, while the converse may not be true. The difference of name may point to some early (and unknown) difference of administration. The **ἐπίσκ.** may have had some special connexion with the celebra-

3. [e]Εὐχαριστῶ[1] τῷ Θεῷ μου ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ [f]μνείᾳ ὑμῶν, 4. πάντοτε [e] Very freq. in Paul in this phrase Judith viii. 25; Inscrr. num. exx. in LXX.
ἐν πάσῃ [g]δεήσει μου ὑπὲρ πάντων ὑμῶν μετὰ χαρᾶς τὴν δέησιν

[f] Confined to Paul, *e.g.*, Rom. i. 9. [g] Rom. x. 1; 2 Tim. i. 3; Eph. vi. 18;

[1] So edd. with ℵABDcE**KLP, vg. syrr. cop. εγω μεν ευχαριστω τω Κυριω ημων D*E*FG, d, e, f, g, Ambrst., Cassiod. In Aug. *de corrept. et gratia*, § 10, "ego quidem" already omitted. Zahn (*Luthardt's Zeitschr.*, 1885, p. 184) would read **εγω μεν**, believing that these words were lost through such parallels as 1 Cor. i. 4, Col. i. 3, Philm. 4; so also Hpt. in Myr.[6]

tion of the Eucharist as the central rite of Christian worship (see Sohm's strong insistence on this point, *Kirchenrecht*, pp. 84 ff., 121 ff.) and with the management of Church property, which would originally consist of voluntary gifts offered to God in Christian worship. Gradually, as those endowed with extraordinary "charisms" (*e.g.*, prophets, teachers, evangelists) passed away, their functions would tend to be assumed by the leading office-bearers in each congregation. So the sphere, *e.g.*, of the **ἐπίσκ.**, would be greatly enlarged. But we must be content, for lack of evidence, to do without precise definitions, only concluding as to the general equivalence in the earliest times of **πρεσβ.** and **ἐπίσκ.**, and granting that their oversight and guidance were concerned with the spiritual as well as the material well-being of the organisation. *Deacons* are first mentioned here in the N.T. It is often tacitly assumed that they hold the office or function whose institution is described in Acts vi. This was an early tradition; *e.g.*, Iren., iii., 12, 10: *Stephanus . . . qui electus est ab apostolis primus diaconus.* But there are considerable arguments against this view. These are admirably summarised by Gwatkin (Hastings' *B.D.*, i., 574). (1) The seven are nowhere in N.T. called **διάκονοι.** (2) The qualifications laid down (Acts vi. 3) for the seven are much higher than those of 1 Tim. iii. 8. (3) Stephen was largely a preacher and Philip an evangelist. (4) The seven evidently rank next to the Apostles at Jerusalem. Hpt. (Myr.[6] *ad loc.*) holds that **ἐπίσκ.** and **διάκ.** denote here the same persons, the **ἐπισκοπή** being a **διακονία** towards the Church, and compares 1 Thess. v. 12, **τοὺς κοπιῶντας καὶ προϊσταμένους.** And the vague use of the word to denote any kind of Christian service (in earlier parts of N.T.) might seem to justify the idea. But considering the late date of Phil., it appears more reasonable to connect the office with that of 1 Tim. iii., where a clear distinction is drawn between the **διάκ.** and the **ἐπίσκ.** In the early Church the most necessary Christian *service* would be the care of the sick and poor. So the deacon must neither be double-tongued (**δίλογος**) nor a "lover of dirty gain" (so Gwatk. tr. **αἰσχροκερδής**), for in his work of visiting he would have temptations to "gossip and slander" on the one hand, and to "picking and stealing from the alms" on the other (Gwatk. *loc. cit.*). Many reasons are assigned for the mention of these officers here. But it seems quite natural that Paul should specify those who stood in the forefront of the Church's work and life, more especially as the letter is one of thanks for the gift which has been sent to him, a gift the management of which would be in the hands of the controlling authorities in the Church.

Ver. 2. Paul feels that the ordinary Greek salutation **χαίρειν** or the Eastern **εἰρήνη σοι** is too meagre for Christian intercourse. But closely connected with **χαίρειν** is his own great watchword **χάρις,** a word which, perhaps, above all others, shows the powerful remoulding of terms by Christian thought and feeling. **χάρις** for Paul is the central revelation of the fatherly heart of God in the redemption which Christ has accomplished for unworthy sinners. And its direct result is **εἰρήνη,** the harmony and health of that life which is reconciled to God through Jesus Christ; see an interesting discussion of the Apostolic greeting by F. Zimmer, *Luthardt's Zeitschr.*, 1886, p. 443 ff. Of course **ἀπό** governs **Κυρίου.** The Socinian exegesis which makes **K.** depend on **πατρός** is impossible in view of Tit. i. 4 (so Gw. *ad loc.*).—**Κυρίου.** The favourite designation of Jesus Christ in the early Church. See on chap. ii. 11 *infr.* *Cf.* the extraordinary frequency of the term **δεσπότης** as applied to God in Apostolic Fathers, etc. On the whole subject see Harnack, *Dogmen-Geschichte*, i., pp. 153-158.

ποιούμενος, 5. ἐπὶ τῇ [h] κοινωνίᾳ ὑμῶν [i] εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἀπὸ [1] πρώτης ἡμέρας ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν· 6. [k] πεποιθὼς [l] αὐτὸ τοῦτο, ὅτι ὁ [m] ἐναρξάμενος ἐν ὑμῖν [n] ἔργον ἀγαθὸν [o] ἐπιτελέσει ἄχρις [2] [p] ἡμέρας

h Rom. xv. 26; 2 Cor. ix. 13; Heb. xiii. 16.
i Acts xxiv. 17; 1 Cor. xvi. 1.
k Constrn. ver. 25; chap. ii. 18.
l Rom. xiii. 6; 2 Cor. vii. 11; Gal. ii. 10 *et al.*
m Gal. iii. 3. v. 5; 2 Cor. i. 14; 1 Thess. v. 2.
n Rom. xiv. 20.
o 2 Cor. viii. 6, 11. Freq. in later books of LXX.
p 1 Cor. For thought, *cf.* 2 Thess. i. 11.

[1] So Hpt. with DEFGKL, Chr., Thdrt. απο της πρωτης W.H., Ws., Lft. (brackets) with ℵABP 37, Euthal.cod. Possibly της is a later addition.

[2] So Trg., Lft. (αχρι[ς]) with DEFGKLP, Chr., Thdrt. W.H., Ws., Alf. αχρι with ℵB, Euthal.cod. (A αχρι ης).

Vv. 3-8. His thankfulness, love and confidence for the Philippians. —Ver. 3. Much may be said in favour of the reading **ἐγὼ μὲν εὐχαριστῶ** (see crit. note) from the point of view of sense. The antithesis would then show that the letter is a direct reply to one received from Philippi, and the emphasis on Paul's own thanksgiving would be accounted for (with Zahn) by the supposition that the Philippians imagined a slight lack of cordiality on his part. This supposition is favoured by the prominence given in the Epistle to Paul's delight in them.—**εὐχ. τ. Θ. ἐπί.** *Cf.* 1 Cor. i. 4, **εὐχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ . . . ἐπὶ τῇ χάριτι . . . τῇ δοθείσῃ ὑμῖν**; *Papyr. Lond.*, xlii., **κομισαμένη τὴν παρά σου ἐπιστολὴν παρ' Ὥρου . . . ἐπὶ μὲν τῷ ἐρρῶσθα[ί] σε εὐθέως τοῖς Θεοῖς εὐχαρίστουν** (quoted by Dsm., *BS.*, p. 210). A word condemned by the grammarians, but in common use from the time of Polyb., and found in modern Greek as **εὐχαριστῶ** (Hatz., *Einleit.*, p. 285).—**ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ μνείᾳ ὑμῶν.** These words have been the subject of much discussion. No doubt **ἐπί** could be used here in what Ell. calls its "ethico-local" sense of a circumstance or experience regarded as the basis of an action, and thus the meaning would be: "I give thanks to my God at my whole remembrance of you" ("every remembrance" is, it seems to us, in spite of Kl., Lips. and Weizs., linguistically impossible). Or, what is more natural after **εὐχαριστῶ** (see exx. *supr.*), **ἐπί** may be "on account of". This would make good sense. The total impression left upon him by his intercourse with them is one which calls forth thankfulness. There is another possible meaning supported by Hfm., Zahn, Wohl., Harnack (*Th. LZ.*, 1889, col. 419) and Sohm (*Kirchenrecht*, p. 81). **ὑμῶν** may be gen. of subject, and so we should translate: "on account of your whole remembrance of me". This would accord admirably with the context, preparing the way for **κοινωνία** (ver. 5), and pointing delicately to the practical expression of their thoughtfulness. The only serious objection to it is that the other interpretation fits in more suitably with the parallels Rom. i. 8, 9, 1 Cor. i. 4, Eph. i. 16, Col. i. 3, 1 Thess. i. 2 and those in LXX.

Ver. 4. Various divisions of these words have been proposed, some referring **πάντοτε . . . ὑμῶν** to the preceding verse, others taking **πάντοτε . . . μου** together, and regarding the remainder of the sentence as a connected whole. It seems least arbitrary to find in ver. 4 a complete thought. The prominence of **πᾶς** shows the exuberance of his joy in them.—**δεήσει.** A special aspect of **προσευχή**, that of entreaty for the satisfaction of some known want; *cf.* Ell. on 1 Tim. ii. 1.—**μετὰ χαρᾶς.** The undertone of the whole letter.—**δ. ποιούμενος.** An interesting parallel in *Papyr.* of Faijûm, 172 A.D., **δικαίαν δέ[ησ]ιν ποιούμενος** (Dsm., *NBS.*, p. 78), in the general sense of "asking" (*cf.* **δεήσεις ποιεῖσθαι**, Luke v. 33, 1 Tim. ii. 1).

Ver. 5. On what does **ἐπί** depend? Surely it follows **χαρᾶς** of preceding clause (so Chr., Th. Mps.) rather than **εὐχαριστῶ** of ver. 3. It is, at least, awkward to take **ἐπί** twice with the same verb. **μ. χαρᾶς** has an emphatic position. Now he gives the reason for his joy.—**τῇ κοινωνίᾳ.** At the first glance **κ.** seems to refer to their mutual fellowship and harmony as Christians. A closer examination reveals that this whole passage is concerned with Paul's personal relation to them. And so **κ.** anticipates **συγκοινωνούς** (ver. 7), and will mean their common participation with Paul in spreading the Gospel. This really includes the idea of united action on the one hand, and the concrete expression of their helpfulness, their gift to the Apostle,

Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ[1]· 7. καθώς ἐστι[2] δίκαιον ἐμοὶ τοῦτο [q]φρονεῖν ὑπὲρ πάντων ὑμῶν, διὰ τὸ ἔχειν με ἐν τῇ [r]καρδίᾳ ὑμᾶς, ἔν τε τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου καὶ τῇ[3] [s]ἀπολογίᾳ καὶ [t]βεβαιώσει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, [u]συγκοινω-

[q] Characteristic of this Ep., *cf.* Rom. xii. 16 *al.* [r] Rom. x. 1; 2 Cor. vii. 3. [s] 2 Tim. iv. 16 *al.* *cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 10. [t] In N.T. only here and Heb. vi. 16; Wisd. vi. 18. [u] 1 Cor. ix. 23;

[1] So Lft., Hpt., W.H. (Γ) with ℵAFGKP, syrr. cop. arm., Chr., Euth.cod., Thdrt. Ti., Ws., Alf. **X. I.** with BDEL 1, 72, *al.*, d, e, f, g, vg., Aug., Ambrst. Ws. (*TK.*, p. 134) holds that **I. X.** was suggested by ver. 2.

[2] All edd. **εστιν** with MSS.

[3] **εν** before **τη απολ.** inserted by all edd. (Lachm. brackets) with ℵBDb etc EKLP, Chr., Euth.cod., Thdrt., d, e, f, g. See Ws. (*TK.*, p. 105), who thinks that **εν** was passed over because wanting before **βεβαι.**, the copyists overlooking the fact that **βεβ.** was included with **απολ.** under one article.

on the other. Hort (*Christian Ecclesia*, p. 44) points out that there is something concrete in the **κοινωνία** of Acts ii. 42. The same is true of Rom. xv. 26, 2 Cor. ix. 13, Heb. xiii. 16. This concrete notion in **κ.** (almost equiv. to "contribution") is supported by the use of **εἰς**, which is employed technically in contexts like this to denote the *destination* of money-payments, collections, etc. So 1 Cor. xvi. 1, **τῆς λογίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους**; Acts xxiv. 17, **ἐλεημοσύνας ποιήσων εἰς τὸ ἔθνος μου.** Important exx. from Papyri in Dsm., *BS.*, pp. 113-114, *NBS.*, p. 23. *Cf.* on the whole idea the most apt comment of Chr. *ad loc.*: **ὅταν γὰρ ἐκεῖνος μὲν κηρύττῃ, σὺ δὲ θεραπεύῃς τὸν κηρύττοντα, κοινωνεῖς αὐτῷ τῶν στεφάνων. ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἔξωθεν ἀγῶσιν οὐ τοῦ ἀγωνιζομένου μόνον ἐστὶν ὁ στέφανος ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ παιδοτρίβου καὶ τοῦ θεραπεύοντος καὶ πάντων ἁπλῶς τῶν ἀσκούντων τὸν ἀθλητήν.—τὸ εὐαγγ.** It is unnecessary to narrow this down to the preaching of the Gospel. Used comprehensively.—**ἀπὸ πρώτης.** *Cf.* the account of their generosity in chap. iv. 10 ff.—**ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν.** The same phrase in Rom. viii. 22. *Cf. Papyr.* of Faijûm **μέχρ[ι] τ[οῦ] νῦν** in Dsm., *NBS.*, p. 81.

Ver. 6. **αὐτὸ τοῦτο.** Accus. of the "inner object," where the neuter pronoun takes the place of a cognate substantive; *cf.* 2 Cor. xiii. 1, **τρίτον τοῦτο ἔρχομαι** (see Blass, *Gram.*, p. 89). **αὐτὸ τοῦτο** is characteristic of Paul, "the firm touch of an intent mind" (Moule, *CT. ad loc.*). "Having this firm persuasion." Curiously enough, the same confident assurance, although based on very different grounds, is characteristic also of the later Jewish theology, *e.g.*, *Apocal. of Baruch* (ed. Charles), xiii., 3. "Thou shalt be assuredly preserved to the consummation of the times." Also xxv., 1; lxxvi., 2. "Christianity, by its completely rounded view of the world, guarantees to believers that they shall be preserved unto eternal life in the kingdom of God, which is God's revealed end in the world" (Ritschl, *Justification*, E. Tr., p. 200).—**ἐναρξάμενος.** This verb, although a word of ritual in classical Greek, is found in LXX (Pentat.) apparently in the simple sense "begin". In its only other occurrence in N.T., Gal. iii. 3, it is combined with **ἐπιτελέω** as here.—**ἔργον ἀγαθόν.** De W., Lft. and others refer this to **κοινωνία** of ver. 5. Is it not far more natural to regard it as "the work of God" *par excellence*, the production of spiritual life, the imparting of the **χάρις** of ver. 7? *Cf.* chap. ii. 13 and esp. Rom. xiv. 20, **μὴ ἕνεκεν βρώματος κατάλυε τὸ ἔργον τοῦ Θεοῦ.—ἡμέρας Ἰ. Χ.** On the order **Ἰ. Χ.**, see ver. 1 *supr.* **ἡμ.** lacks the article on the analogy of **ἡμέρα Κυρίου** (LXX). This favourite conception of O.T. prophecy refers to "the time when the Lord reveals Himself in His fulness to the world, when He judges evil and fulfils His great purposes of redemption among men. . . . But the judgment has not its end in itself, it is but the means of making Jehovah known to the world, and this knowledge of Him is salvation" (Davidson, *Nahum*, etc., p. 105). It is easy to see how the N.T. idea grows out of this. Paul probably assumes that the day is not far off, but indulges in no dogmatising. This name is given to the day because Christ as **Κύριος** is to be judge. Belief in the Parousia of Christ has a most prominent place in Paul's religious thought. He never attempts to specify the time. But it cheers him, esp. in crises of his history (as

v Rom. i. 9; Gal. i. 20.
w Chap. ii. 26; 2 Cor. ix. 14; *cf.* Ps. cxix. 131.
x 2 Cor. vii. 15; Philm. 12.

v νούς [1] μου [2] τῆς χάριτος πάντας ὑμᾶς ὄντας. 8. [v] μάρτυς γάρ μού ἐστιν [3] ὁ Θεός, ὡς [w] ἐπιποθῶ πάντας ὑμᾶς ἐν [x] σπλάγχνοις Ἰησοῦ [4]

[1] So also Trg. with BcKsil.LP. Other edd. **συνκ.** with ℵAB*DEFG, Euth.cod. See Ws., *TK.*, pp. 138-139.

[2] So all edd. **τ. χαρ. μου**, DEFG, d, e, f, g, vg. **μοι τ. χαρ.** 39, 43, 52, Euth.cod., Thphyl. O.L. (Freising Fragg., Ambrst.) *gaudii*, which presupposes **χαρας.**

[3] Om. Ti., W.H., Lft., Ws., Trg. with ℵ*BFgr.G 17, d, e, g, æth., Th. Mps. (*Cat.*, 236). Text in ℵcADgr.Egr.KLP, f, vg. syrp. cop., Thdrt., Ambrst. Myr. supposes it to be a reminiscence of Rom. i. 9.

[4] So also Hpt. with FKL, f, vg.cle. cop., Thdrt., Ambrst. **X. I.** Ti., W.H., Ws., Lft., Alf., Trg. with ℵABD*EGP 17, 37, d, e, g, am. sah., Bas.

in this Epistle), to believe that the Lord is near. (See Teichmann, *Die paulin. Vorstellungen von Auferstehung und Gericht*, p. 11 ff.). There is perhaps no part of Paul's thought in which it is so difficult to trace a fixed outline of ideas as the eschatological. And yet there is no part more regulative for him than this.

Ver. 7. **δίκαιον.** = our "right" or "natural".—**τοῦτο φρονεῖν ὑπ. ὑμ.** Not "think this concerning you," but "have this care on your behalf"; *cf.* chap. iv. 10, **τὸ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ φρονεῖν. τοῦτο** of course refers to the finishing in them of God's "good work". **φρ.** seems always to keep in view the *direction* which thought (of a practical kind) takes. **ὑπέρ** usually has the sense of "interest in" (so Lft.).—**διὰ τὸ κ.τ.λ.** Paul's only use of **διά** with infin.—**ἐν τ. καρδίᾳ.** Perhaps it is best (with Zahn) to take **κ.** here not so much as the seat of the softer feelings, but rather as the abode of the stronger thoughts, resolutions, etc. A regular Greek usage. *Cf.* 1 Cor. ii. 9, 2 Cor. iii. 15, iv. 6 *et al.* Thus the whole expression would almost be equiv. to "I know that you," etc.; *cf.* **ἄσβεστον ὑμῶν περιφέρω τὴν μνήμην** (Thdrt.). His love is expressed in the next verse.—Evidently **ἔν τε τοῖς δεσμ. κ.τ.λ.** goes with the following clause, for it is much more natural to suppose a break at the first **ὑμᾶς,** which is resumed by the second. On **ἐν** before **τ. ἀπολ.** see crit. note. Paul separates here (so also Wohl.) between his **δεσμοί** and his **ἀπολογία,** which makes up one idea with **βεβαίωσις.** It seems to us clear that this **ἀπολ.** marks a crisis in his circumstances of which the influence is seen all through the Epistle; *cf.*, *e.g.*, vv. 19, 25, chap. ii. 23, 24. Ought it not to be taken in its ordinary judicial sense of a defence against a regular charge? (as against Lft. and Moule, *CT.*, who refer **ἀπ.** and **βεβ.** to Paul's missionary work at Rome, and Hpt., who thinks of Paul's whole activity in refuting opponents, both public and private). The correctness of this view receives strong confirmation from Dsm. (*BS.*, p. 100 ff.), who shows that Paul, like the Translators of the LXX, was well acquainted with the technical sense of **βεβαίωσις** (Lat. *evictio*), the obligation under which the seller came to the buyer to guarantee against all claims his right to what he had bought. So Paul's defence before the emperor is a guarantee of the Gospel, a warrant of its value and claims. For **ἀπολ.** see 2 Tim. iv. 16. "My defence and confirmation of the Gospel."—**συνκ. μ. τ. χάρ. χάρις** here must be the great central gift of God's grace, which Paul always keeps in the foreground. *Cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 10, **χάριτι δὲ Θεοῦ εἰμὶ ὅ εἰμι, καὶ ἡ χάρις αὐτοῦ ἡ εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ κενὴ ἐγενήθη.** There is no need to limit it to the grace of apostleship or to that granted to him in his trials and sufferings. Their love and kindness towards him and his great work, even at the darkest moments in his career, are proof enough that they share along with him in the grace of God. It is probably better to separate **μου** from **χάριτος.** [J. Weiss (*Th. LZ.*, 1899, col. 263) would read **χρείας,** comparing chap. ii. 25, iv. 16, Rom. xii. 13. Certainly this would give good sense and be more pointed.]

Ver. 8. An exact parallel is Rom. i. 9-11, **μάρτυς γάρ μού ἐστιν ὁ Θεός . . . ὡς ἀδιαλείπτως μνείαν ὑμῶν ποιοῦμαι . . . ἐπιποθῶ γὰρ ἰδεῖν ὑμᾶς.** Such adjuration of God he uses only in solemn personal appeals; *cf.* Gal. i. 20. Perhaps this goes to justify Zahn in supposing

Χριστοῦ. 9. καὶ [γ]τοῦτο προσεύχομαι, [z]ἵνα ἡ ἀγάπη ὑμῶν ἔτι μᾶλλον καὶ μᾶλλον [a]περισσεύῃ[1] ἐν [b]ἐπιγνώσει καὶ πάσῃ [c]αἰσθήσει, y 2 Cor. xiii. 9. z Mark xiv. 35; 1 Cor. xiv. 13.

a Rom. xv. 13 *al.* 1 Cor. xiii. 12. Several times in P. in this sense and construction. b Four times in Col.; *cf.* c Only here in N.T., sev. exx. in Prov.

So Ti., W.H. (ℸ), Lft., Myr., Hpt., Alf., Trg. with ℵAK**L, Clem., Bas., Chr., Thdrt. περισσευσῃ. Lachm., Ws., W.H. (mg.), Trg. (mg.) with BDE 37, kscr. Myr. accounts for **-σῃ** by similarity of sounds in terminations of **επιγνωσει, αισθησει, πασῃ.** Ws. thinks, conversely, that **-σῃ** was transformed into **-η** under the influence of present **προσευχομαι** (*TK.*, p. 42).

that the Philippians had imagined some lack of cordiality in Paul's reception of their gift. Comm. have noted the intensity of language manifested in the compound **ἐπιποθῶ**. But it is needful to remember the fondness of later Greek for compounds which had lost their strong sense. Calvin, with practical insight: *neque enim parum hoc valet ad fidem doctrinæ faciendam cum persuasus est populus a doctore se amari.*—**ἐν σπλάγχνοις.** "With the heart of Jesus Christ" (with which his own has become identified). This amounts to the same thing as love. *Cf.* Gal. ii. 20, which is the best comment. Possibly Paret (*Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.*, iii., 1, p. 25) is not too fanciful in finding here a definite recollection of Jesus' nature, of which **σπλαγχνίζεσθαι** (in the Gospels) is a common expression. Every genuine pastor has some experience of this feeling.

Vv. 9-11. PRAYER FOR THEIR INCREASE IN CHRISTIAN DISCERNMENT.—Ver. 9. Zahn would put this clause under the government of **ὡς** in the preceding sentence. No strong argument can be used against this, but it is doubtful whether the explanation is necessary. In the use of **ἵνα** here, "purport" (to adopt Ellicott's expression) seems to be blended with "purpose". There are certainly passages in which the full "*telic*" force of **ἵνα** cannot be fairly asserted. This accords with the development of the later language. See Hatz., *Einl.*, p. 214 ff. Possibly **ἵνα** in this passage is rhetorically parallel to **ἵνα** in ver. 10. (See J. Weiss, *Beiträge zur Paulin. Rhetorik*, p. 9.)—**ἡ ἀγάπη ὑμ.** can scarcely mean anything else than "your love towards one another". This has been already exemplified in their **κοινωνία** with Paul.—**περισσεύῃ.** In LXX, chiefly in Sirach. It is mainly in Paul's writings that it reaches this derivative sense of "abound". In the Synoptics it still means (usually), as in ordinary Greek, "to remain over". *Sola charitas non admittit excessum* (Bacon, *de Augm. Scient.*, vii., 3, quoted by Gwynn).—**ἐπιγν. κ. π. αἰσθ.** Apparently an eager and enthusiastic spirit prevailed in this Church. As so commonly, it might be accompanied by a slight want of discernment. That would lead, on the one hand, to misunderstandings over trifling matters (*cf.* chap. iv. 2?), on the other, to giving heed to plausible teachers. As the Galatians combined enthusiasm and fickleness, perhaps, at Philippi, enthusiasm was apt to prevail over spiritual common sense. Is not Lft. mistaken in annotating "Love imparts a sensitiveness of touch," etc.? This is not before Paul's mind. His prayer is that the sensitiveness of touch may be added to love.—**ἐπιγν.** A favourite word in the Epistles of the imprisonment. A good example of its intensive force is 1 Cor. xiii. 12, **ἄρτι γινώσκω ἐκ μέρους, τότε δὲ ἐπιγνώσομαι καθὼς καὶ ἐπεγνώσθην.** Very frequent in Justin M., *e.g.*, a definition of **ἐπιστήμη** (*Dial.*, 221 A), **ἐπιστήμη τίς ἐστιν ἡ παρέχουσα αὐτῶν τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων καὶ τῶν θείων γνῶσιν, ἔπειτα τῆς τούτων θειότητος καὶ δικαιοσύνης ἐπίγνωσιν.** *Cf. Dial.*, 220 D; *Apol.*, ii. 10, 19. Here = a firm conception of those spiritual principles which would guide them in their relations with one another and the world.—**αἰσθήσει.** Moral sensibility, quickness of ethical tact. Originally of sense-perception, but applicable to the inner world of sensibilities. Kl. quotes aptly from Hippocrates, *de Off. Med.*, 3, **ἃ καὶ τῇ ὄψι καὶ τῇ ἁφῇ καὶ τῇ ἀκοῇ καὶ τῇ ῥινὶ καὶ τῇ γλώσσῃ καὶ τῇ γνώμῃ ἔστιν αἰσθέσθαι.** A complete parallel is Heb. v. 14, where the writer defines the **τέλειοι** (*cf.* Phil. iii. 12, 15-16) as **τῶν διὰ τὴν ἕξιν τὰ αἰσθητήρια γεγυμνασμένα ἐχόντων πρὸς διάκρισιν καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ.**—**πάσῃ.** Probably "all kinds of".

Ver. 10. **δοκ. τὰ διαφ.** *Cf.* Rom. ii. 18, **δοκιμάζεις τὰ διαφ.** Two possible renderings. (1) "Approve things that are excellent." (2) "Test things that

d Rom. i. 11, xii. 2 *al.* e 2 Pet. iii. 1 Wisd. vii. 25. *Noun*, 1 Cor. v. 8; 2 Cor. ii. 17. f Acts xxiv. 16; 1 Cor. x. 32. Scarcely found in secular writers. g Heb. xii. 11; Jas. iii. 18; Prov. xi. 30 *al.* h Chap. ii. 11; Rom. xv. 7; Eph. i. 6, 14. i Jude 5. k Acts xxiv. 22, xxv. 14; Eph. vi. 21.

d εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν ὑμᾶς τὰ διαφέροντα, ἵνα ἦτε e εἰλικρινεῖς καὶ
10. ἀπρόσκοποι εἰς ἡμέραν Χριστοῦ, 11. πεπληρωμένοι g καρπῶν [1]
δικαιοσύνης τῶν [1] διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,[2] εἰς δόξαν καὶ h ἔπαινον Θεοῦ.
12. Γινώσκειν δὲ ὑμᾶς i βούλομαι, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι k τὰ κατ' ἐμὲ

[1] So P, syrr. cop., Chr., Thphyl. **καρπον . . . τον.** All edd. with ℵABDEFGKL O.L. sah., Thdrt., Ambrst. B (with 116, 122) om. **τον.** See Ws., *TK.*, p. 78 *fin.*, who assigns the omission to carelessness.

[2] The important cursive 37 reads **X. I.** with amiat.

differ," *i.e.*, good and bad. Lft. opposes (2) on the ground that "it requires no keen moral sense to discriminate between good and bad". But was not this precisely the great difficulty for heathen-Christians? Theophyl. defines **τὰ διαφ.** by **τί δεῖ πρᾶξαι καὶ τί δεῖ μὴ πρᾶξαι.** The idea seems to be borne out by the following **εἰλικρ.** and **ἀπρόσκ.** We are therefore compelled to decide for (2). "The fundamental choice arrived at in believing has to be reiterated continually in a just application of it to a world of varying and sometimes perplexing cases" (Rainy, *Expos. Bib.*, p. 37). There are exx. of **τὰ διαφ.** in chap. iii. *passim.* Of course this **δοκιμάζειν** is made possible by the guidance of the indwelling Spirit. It shows us "the highest point which Paul reaches in his treatment of moral questions" (Hltzm., *N.T. Theol.*, ii., p. 149, who points out as instances of his delicate moral tact the precepts given in 1 Cor. viii.-x., Rom. xiv.). —**εἰλικρ. κ. ἀπρόσκ.** There is no warrant for adhering to the common derivation of **εἰλικρ.** from **κρίνω** compounded with either **εἴλη** ("heat of sun") and so = "tested by sunbeam," or **εἴλη** (= **ἴλη** "troops") and so "separated into ranks". The word is the equiv. of Lat. *sincerus*, "pure," "unmixed". A favourite term in Plato for pure intellect and also for the soul purged from sense. *Cf. Phaedo*, 66 A, 67 A, 81 B. Naturally transferred to the moral sphere. T. H. Green (*Two Sermons*, p. 41) describes **εἰλικρίνεια** as "perfect openness towards God". **ἀπρόσκ.** will then mean, in all probability, "not giving offence" to others, the obverse side of **εἰλικρ.** This sense seems to us to be proved by 1 Cor. x. 32 with the context, which is simply an expansion of Paul's thought here. *Cf.* also 1 John ii. 10.—**εἰς ἡμέραν Χρ. εἰς** has the meanings "with a view to" and "until," which here shade off into each other. The conception of **ἡμ. X.** "grew in Paul's hands to a whole æon, lasting from the **παρουσία** to the **τέλος**" (Beysch., *N.T. Th.*, ii., p. 273).

Ver. 11. Critical evidence (see above) fixes **καρπὸν . . . τόν** as the correct reading. We should, of course, expect the gen. (see the *v.l.*), but one of the most marked features in later Greek is the enlarging of the sphere of the accus. It is quite common to find it with verbs like **κληρονομεῖν** and **κρατεῖν κ.τ.λ.** *Cf.* in modern Greek **γέμω χρήματα,** "I am full of possessions" (see Hatz., *Einl.*, pp. 220-223; F. Krebs, *Rection d. Casus in d. späteren histor. Gräcität*, Heft i., pp. 3-4, ii., p. 3 ff.).—**καρπ. δικ.** A frequent phrase in Prov. (LXX). A showing forth of the results of righteousness. There is nothing here about justification, as Moule supposes. It is right conduct the Apostle has in view. But it is hardly needful to note that with Paul there can be no dissociation of the two ideas. **δικαιοσύνη** is always with him the right relation between God and man, made possible through Christ, which asserts itself, under the Holy Spirit's influence, in righteous conduct.—**διὰ Ἰ. X.** The **καρπός** as well as the **δικ.** is due to Christ (*cf.* chap. iv. 13).—**εἰς δ. κ. ἔπ. Θ.** *Cf.* the refrain in Eph. i. 6, 12, 14, and Christ's words in John xvii. 4, **ἐγώ σε ἐδόξασα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.** The disciple must be as the Master.

Vv. 12-14. HIS PRESENT SITUATION. —Ver. 12. **γινώσκ. δὲ ὑ. β.** A common epistolary phrase. *Cf.* **ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι βουλόμεθα** in a Letter to the magistrates of Oropus from the Roman Consuls, 73 B.C. (Viereck, *Sermo Graecus*, etc., Gött., 1888, p. 36). **δέ,** as so frequently, is transitional.—**τὰ κατ' ἐμέ** = my circumstances. In later Greek **κατά** came to be a regular periphrasis for the gen. W. Schmidt (*de elocut. Josephi*, pp. 21-22) gives striking exx. from Josephus, *e.g.*, *Antt.*, i., 296, **τοῦ κατ' ἐκείνους συγγενοῦς,** where **κατ' ἐκ.**

μᾶλλον εἰς [l]προκοπὴν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐλήλυθεν· 13. ὥστε τοὺς [l] Ver. 25; 1 Tim. iv. 15; Sirach li. 17; 2 Macc. viii. 8.
δεσμούς μου [m]φανεροὺς ἐν Χριστῷ γενέσθαι ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ [n]πραιτωρίῳ

m Constrn. chap. iii. 21; 1 Thess. iii. 13. n πρ. four times in Gospp. = governor's palace. So Acts xxiii. 35.

= **ἐκείνων**. See also Kaelker, *Quaestiones de elocut. Polybiana*, p. 282. This is Paul's first reference to his own affairs, which were of the deepest concern to the Philippians. Their gift had been prompted by their apprehensions of his sore need. Perhaps, as Calvin suggests, his opponents were using his calamities as a proof of the worthlessness of his Gospel.—**μᾶλλον εἰς προκ. . . . ἐλήλ.** The use of **μᾶλλον** seems to imply that they were looking out for bad news of the Apostle. And that would justify the supposition that, shortly before this, a change had occurred in Paul's circumstances. May not the change be connected with the **ἀπολογία** of ver. 7? Is it not probable that Paul had been transferred from his hired lodging (Acts xxviii. 30) into the prison where those on trial were kept in custody? O. Hirschfeld (*Sitz. Bericht.* of Berlin Academy, 1891, pp. 857-858) holds that imprisonment at Rome was of a military character, and that the barracks of various city troops served as prisons. Mommsen (*op. cit.*, 1895, p. 500) agrees with Hirschf. in believing that the *castra peregrinorum* may have been used esp. for this purpose. The Philippians would naturally expect that this stricter custody must mean severer hardships for the Apostle. As a matter of fact it has been in his favour. **προκοπή** is a technical term in Stoic philosophy for "progress towards wisdom" (see Zeller, *Stoics*, etc., p. 294). It is condemned by Phrynichus (ed. Lobeck, p. 85) as unclassical. Frequent in later Greek, esp. in Plutarch and Polyb.—**ἐλήλυθεν.** *Cf.* Mark v. 26, **εἰς τὸ χεῖρον ἐλθοῦσα** (why should Ell. object to this parallel?), Acts xix. 27.

Ver. 13. For the skilful rhetorical structure of vv. 13-17 see J. Weiss, *Beitr.*, p. 17, who compares Rom. ii. 6-12.—**τὰ δεσμά** is, on the whole, more common; see Luke viii. 29, Acts xvi. 26, xx. 23. According to Cobet, *Mnemosyne*, 1858, p. 74 ff. (quoted in W-Sch., p. 85, *n.* 8), the neuter form refers to actual bonds, the masc. to the imprisonment. But there seems to be no distinction, *e.g.*, in Attic Inscrr. (see Meisterhans, *Gramm. d. attisch. Inschr.*, p. 112, *n.* 1025). And Sch. states that the distinction will not apply to LXX.—**φαν. ἐν Χ. γεν.** It has become plain that he is a prisoner wholly for Christ's sake, and not on account of any breach of law. **γεν.** must be translated by the English perfect, for, as Moule (*CT.*) well points out, "our English thought separates present from past less rapidly than Greek". Of course we must supply **δεσμ.** as predicate with **φαν. γεν.**—**ἐν ὅλῳ τ. πραιτ.** is one of the most keenly contested expressions in the Epistle. Four leading interpretations are found. (1) *Those forming the praetorian guard.* So Lft., Hfm., Abbott, Hpt., Vinc. This explanation has much in its favour. Those coming up on appeal from the Provinces were handed over for surveillance to the *praefecti praetorio* (see Marquardt-Momms., ii. 2^3, p. 972 and *n.* 2). And Lft. (*Com.*, pp. 99-104) has shown conclusively that the word admits of this meaning. (2) *The barracks or camp of the praetorian guard.* So Lips., Kl., Alf., De W., Myr., Ws., Von Soden. But none of these Comm. bring direct evidence to show that the name *praetorium* was ever definitely applied to the *castra praetoriana*, built under Tiberius at the Porta Viminalis (Tac., *Ann.*, iv., 2). (3) *The emperor's palace.* So Chr., Th. Mps., Thdrt., Beng., Mynster (*Kleine theol. Schriften*, p. 184, some strong arguments), Gwynn, Duchesne. In all other passages of N.T. **πραιτ.** = residence of the ruler. It is said that it would be impossible for anyone writing from Rome to call the palace **πραιτ.** But, as Gw. observes, this is a provincial writing to provincials, and using the word in a familiar sense. Further, the change for the better in Paul's circumstances is connected with the knowledge that his bonds are in Christ. Is it because the *authorities* (emperor, etc.) have already begun to take a favourable view of his case that the preaching is allowed to prosper without hindrance and that his associates take courage? This interpretation cannot be dismissed altogether lightly. (4) *The judicial authorities.* So Mommsen (*op. cit.*, p. 498) and Ramsay (*St. Paul*, etc., p. 357 ff.). These would be the *praefecti praetorio* (either one or two) with their assessors and other officials of the imperial court. Momms. quotes from a letter of Trajan to Pliny (*Ep. Plin.*, 57 [65]), in which he decides that a criminal condemned to exile, but, in spite of this,

καὶ [o] τοῖς λοιποῖς πᾶσι, 14. καὶ τοὺς πλείονας τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἐν Κυρίῳ [p] πεποιθότας τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου [q] περισσοτέρως τολμᾶν [1] ἀφόβως τὸν λόγον [2] λαλεῖν. 15. Τινὲς μὲν καὶ διὰ φθόνον καὶ ἔριν, τινὲς

o *Cf.* Luke xxiv. 9.
p Philm. 21; 2 Kings xviii. 20 *al.*
q In Paul and Hebrews.

[1] So Alf., W.H. Ti., Trg., Ws. τολμᾶν.

[2] So DcE**K, Chr.(occas.), Thdrt., Ell. (who calls του Θεου "a nearly certain gloss"), Hpt. Other edd. add του Θεου with ℵABD*E*P, d, e, f, vg. sah. cop. arm., Clem., Chr.(some places).

lingering in the province, should be sent in chains *ad praefectos praetorii mei*, who are not the prison officials but those concerned with the hearing of cases. This explanation also would agree well with what Paul says about his bonds and the progress of the Gospel. We would hesitate to decide between (1) and (4), the context seeming to support the latter, while, perhaps, ὅλῳ favours the former.—καὶ τ. λοιποῖς π. *Cf. CIG.*, i., 1770, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς πᾶσιν φανερὰν πεποήκαμεν τήν τε ἰδίαν καὶ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ῥωμαίων προαίρεσιν. Apparently a vague phrase = everywhere else.

Ver. 14. τοὺς πλείονας. Vaughan holds that "from the universal practice of deciding matters by the vote of a majority the term comes to mean *the main body*, the society *as a whole*," but this scarcely seems needful.—τῶν ἀδ. ἐν Κ. These words surely make up one phrase (so Alf., Weizs., Ws., etc., as against Lft., Lips., Myr., etc.). *Cf.* Col. i. 2. It is difficult to see where the tautology, which is said to be involved in this interpretation, comes in. Probably it is an almost technical combination. Dsm. (*BS.*, p. 82) notes from Papyri a precisely similar technical use of ἀδελφός in the language of the Serapeum at Memphis.—πεποιθ. τ. δεσμ. μου. "Having confidence in my bonds," *i.e.*, being encouraged by the favourable light in which his imprisonment was beginning to be regarded when seen in its true character. [This tells in favour of (4) in ver. 13.] *Cf.* Philm. 21, πεποιθὼς τῇ ὑπακοῇ σου.—λαλεῖν. Hpt. believes that λαλ. is used here expressly instead of λέγειν as emphasising the physiological process rather than the word spoken. In the later language these refinements were apt to be overlooked. Still it is interesting to find that in LXX דָּבַר is almost invariably transl. by λαλεῖν and אָמַר by λέγειν.

Vv. 15-18. THE RESULT OF HIS MORE FAVOURABLE CIRCUMSTANCES: CHRIST PREACHED, WHETHER OF SPITE OR GOODWILL.—Ver. 15. τινές. Are these included in the πλείονες of ver. 14 or not? We prefer to believe (so also Weizs., *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.*, 1876, p. 294 ff.) that the Apostle has changed his point of view. For is it conceivable that those who "had confidence" in his bonds should, on the other hand, "raise affliction" (ver. 17) for those bonds? He thinks now not so much of the emboldening of his Christian brethren as of the fact that the Gospel is being preached with great vigour over a wide area. Accordingly τινές may be taken by itself.—Probably καί goes with φθόνον. "Some preach . . . *actually* from envy and rivalry."—ἔριν = "rivalry" (not "strife"), as often. *Cf.* Thuc., vi., 31, 4; Æsch., *Eumen.* (ed. Paley), 933 (where used in a good sense). To whom does Paul refer? It has usually been taken for granted that it must be to his unwearying opponents, the Judaisers. So Myr., Alf., Lft., Franke (esp. *SK.*, 1895, p. 772), Duchesne and others. But, as Hpt. clearly shows, we have no grounds for assuming the existence of a definitely anti-Pauline Jewish-Christian party at Rome (so also Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, pp. 112-113). At the same time this jealousy of the Apostle, a matter of personal feeling, may well have arisen in the Jewish wing of the Roman Church. They would naturally be roused to some bitterness by Paul's emphasis on the universality of the Gospel and his neglect of its specially Jewish setting. But it is unreasonable to divide all the Christians of the Apostolic Age into Gentile-Christians and Judaisers. There would be many Jewish-Christians who never favoured the extreme methods or even doctrines of the latter. (*Cf.* M'Giffert's instructive discussion, *Apost. Age*, pp. 393-395, and Pfl., *Urchrist.*, pp. 147, 151.) It is indeed quite possible that those re-

δὲ καὶ δι' [r]εὐδοκίαν τὸν Χριστὸν κηρύσσουσιν· 16. οἱ μὲν[1] ἐξ [s]ἐριθείας[2] τὸν[3] Χριστὸν [t]καταγγέλλουσιν, οὐχ [u]ἁγνῶς, [v]οἰόμενοι θλῖψιν ἐπιφέρειν[4] τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου· 17. οἱ δὲ ἐξ ἀγάπης, εἰδότες

r Chap. ii. 13; Eph. i. 5, 9. Several exx. in Sirach.

s See note *infra*. t Acts xvii. 3; Col. i. 28. Often in Acts. Only twice in LXX. u Only here in N.T. v In N.T. only found besides in John xxi. 25; Jas. i. 7.

[1] **εξ εριθειας . . .** to end of ver. 16 and **εξ αγαπης . . .** to end of ver. 17 change places. So all edd. with ℵABD*EFGP 17, 23, 37, d, e, f, g, go. sah. cop. arm. æth., Bas., Euth.cod., Tert., Victorin. Non-transposition only found in Dᵇ et c KL (which om. **οι μεν εξ εριθ. . . . δεσμ. μ.**), Chr., Thdrt.

[2] So ℵAB³KP. **εριθιας** DEFG 114. (See Ws., *TK.*, p. 141.)

[3] So Ti., W.H. (ℸ) with ℵ*ADEKP, Bas., Chr., Euth.cod., Thdrt. Ws. om. **τον** with ℵᶜᵃ.BFG, Chr.cod. Trg., Alf., Lach. bracket **τον**.

[4] So DᶜEKL, Chr., Thdrt. All edd. **εγειρειν** with ℵABD*FG 17, 31, O.L. vg. sah. cop. arm. æth., Aug., Ambrst. (DᵇP, Euth.cod. **επεγειρειν**). Thphyl. (mg.) **προσφερειν**.

ferred to here are Pauline Christians who for some reason have a personal pique at the Apostle. (*Cf.* Ws., *Amer. J. of Theol.*, i., 2, pp. 388-389, who throws out the interesting suggestion that they may have been old teachers of the Church who had become jealous of Paul's high position, and so wished to outstrip him and destroy his popularity.) "Paul says nothing here which I have not experienced" (Calv.).—**τινὲς δὲ καί.** Although not explicitly, these, of course, belong to the **πλείονες** of ver. 14. **καί** marks the contrast with the preceding clause. — **δι' εὐδοκίαν.** The word can mean nothing else here than "goodwill". For it is placed in antithesis to **φθόνος** and **ἔρις**, and resumed by **ἀγάπη** below. *Cf.* Sirach, ix., 12, **μὴ εὐδοκήσῃς ἐν εὐδοκίᾳ ἀσεβῶν.**

Vv. 16-17. An overwhelming mass of authority is in favour of transposing these verses as above (see crit. note). *TR.* is simply an emendation based on the order in ver. 15.—Ver. 16. **οἱ μὲν ἐξ ἀγάπης.** Is this a complete phrase or does **ἐξ ἀγ.** qualify the predicate **τ. Χρ. κηρύσσ.** supplied from ver. 15? The latter seems most natural, as it preserves the complete parallelism of the clauses, which would otherwise be disturbed by **οὐχ ἁγνῶς.**—**κεῖμαι** has practically become perf. passive of **τίθημι. τέθειμαι** is seldom used. (See Gildersleeve on Justin M., *Apol.*, i., 11, 6.) Exactly parallel are Luke ii. 34, **οὗτος κεῖται εἰς πτῶσιν καὶ ἀνάστασιν πολλῶν**; 1 Thess. iii. 3, **αὐτοὶ γὰρ οἴδατε ὅτι εἰς τοῦτο κείμεθα.** "Am appointed."

Ver. 17. **ἐξ ἐριθείας.** Here virtually = "selfishness" (rather than "factiousness"). Originally, the character of a worker for pay. Now that which degraded the hired worker, in the estimation of antiquity, was his labouring wholly for his own interests, while it was a sign of the noble to devote himself to the common weal. This sense suits all N.T. passages (Rom. ii. 8, 2 Cor. xii. 20, Gal. v. 20, Jas. iii. 14, 16). See Hpt.'s valuable note from which the above is condensed.—**τὸν Χ.** It is hard to say whether **τόν** ought to be retained. It would easily be accounted for as an assimilation to **τὸν Χ.** in ver. 15.—**καταγγ.** A distinction has been drawn between **καταγγ.** as confined to those sent by Christ and **κηρύσσ.** as applying to all preachers, including our Lord Himself. Probably they are quite synonymous here. *Cf.* an excellent note in Westcott (on 1 John i. 5) on the special signification of **καταγγ.** among compounds of **ἀγγέλλω** = "proclaim with authority, as commissioned to spread the tidings throughout those who hear them".—**οὐχ ἁγν.** "With mixed motives." *Cf.* Pind., *Ol.*, iii., 37, **μεγάλων ἀέθλων ἁγνὰν κρίσιν** (quoted by Alf.).—**οἰόμενοι.** "Purposing." So frequently in later Greek. Schmid (*Atticismus*, i., 128) quotes from Dio Chrys., Aristides and Philostratus. *Cf.* Phryn. (ed. Lobeck), 190, **βιβλίον . . . ὅπερ οἴεται δηλοῦν.** There is a sharp contrast between **εἰδότες** in ver. 16 and **οἰόμενοι** here.—**θλῖψιν ἐγείρειν τ. δεσμ. μ.** The balance of authority is in favour of **ἐγείρειν. ἐπιφέρειν** is probably an ancient gloss, which may have crept into some text from the margin. The phrase apparently means "to stir up vexation for me in my imprisonment". They attributed their own jealous feelings to the Apostle, and could

w Rom. iii. 3
x Acts xx. 23 parall. to correct text here.
y Mark xii. 40; Luke xx. 47.
z Luke xxi. 13.
a Eph. iv. 16 is the only parall. The verb five times in N.T.

ὅτι εἰς ἀπολογίαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου κεῖμαι. 18. [w]τί γάρ; [x]πλὴν [1] παντὶ τρόπῳ, εἴτε [y]προφάσει εἴτε ἀληθείᾳ, Χριστὸς καταγγέλλεται· καὶ ἐν τούτῳ χαίρω, ἀλλὰ καὶ χαρήσομαι. 19. οἶδα γὰρ [2] ὅτι τοῦτό μοι [z]ἀποβήσεται εἰς σωτηρίαν διὰ τῆς ὑμῶν δεήσεως, καὶ [a]ἐπιχορη-

[1] So also Myr. with DEKL, d, e, f, vg. syrr. arm. æth. go., Chr., Thdrt. Ti., W.H., Trg. **πλην οτι** with ℵAFGP 17, sah., Ath.^{523}, Euth.$^{cod.}$, Thphl.$^{mg.}$ Ws. om. **πλην** with B, Ath.$^{cod.}$ See Ws., *TK.*, p. 103. There is much difference of opinion as to the *punctuation*. Ti. has comma after **καταγγ.**, stop at **χαιρω**, and colon after **χαρησ.** Ws. has colon aft. **χαιρω**, stop aft. **χαρησ.** W.H. colon aft. **χαιρω**, comma aft. **χαρησ.** Lft. colon aft. both **χ.** and **χαρησ.** Hpt. and Vaughan would place interrogation aft. **καταγγ.**

[2] So Ti., Alf., Trg. with ℵADEFGKLP, d, e, f, g, vg. syrr. cop. arm. W.H., **γαρ (δε** in mg.). Ws. **δε** with B 37, 61, 116, sah. See his *TK.*, p. 68, where he suggests that it was natural to supplant **δε** by **γαρ** as confirming **χαρησομαι.**

not conceive a greater worry to him than that he should hear of their success in preaching.

Vv. 18-20. His joy in the preaching of Christ and expectation of success in his cause.—Ver. 18. There seems little doubt that we should read **πλὴν ὅτι,** as there would be a tendency to omit either word to simplify the sense. Ws. holds that **πλήν** was inserted because copyists did not notice that **ὅτι** is causal, introducing a protasis. But it is difficult to imagine this misunderstanding if **ὅτι** stood alone. **τί γάρ** probably goes closely with **οἰόμενοι** preceding. "Supposing they purpose, etc., what then? Only that . . . Christ is preached." **τί γάρ** has its usual classical sense. For **πλ. ὅτι** in this usage, *cf.* Acts xx. 22-23, **τὰ . . . συναντήσοντα ἐμοὶ μὴ εἰδώς, πλὴν ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα . . . διαμαρτύρεται.**—**προφάσει ε. ἀληθ.** A common antithesis. The one party preached the Gospel, ostensibly for Christ's sake, really to gain their own ends.—The best punctuation of the next clause is that of W.H., who place a colon after **χαίρω** and a comma after **χαρησ.**—**ἐν τούτῳ.** Must not **τ.** mean "the fact that, in spite of my imprisonment, Christ is preached"? It seems far-fetched to refer it to his imprisonment.—**χαίρω.** Assuming that Paul's opponents here were Judaisers, Comm. have been driven to desperate shifts to explain his joy in their preaching. This verse was quoted in the early Church in favour of heretics, so that Chr., Th. Mps. and Thdrt. have to protest against the abuse of it (see Swete, *Th. Mps.*, i., p. 209). When reasonably interpreted it presents no serious difficulties. — **ἀλλὰ κ. χαρήσ.** Closely connected with the following verse, but not necessarily introducing a new subject (as Hfm.). It has almost the same force as if **οὐ μόνον** had preceded. The **κοινή** form for **χαιρήσω**, like **ζήσομαι** for **ζήσω** in N.T. *Cf. CIA.*, ii., 593, *b*, 18 (2 cent. B.C.). Found in LXX, where **χαροῦμαι** also occurs (W-Sch., p. 108, *n.* 8). This is a progressive future. *Cf.* Rom. vi. 2 (see Burton, *MT.*, p. 32). Perhaps we can detect, as some have suggested, a note of loneliness and resignation in this verse (*cf.* chap. ii. 21).

Ver. 19. The only apparent ground for reading **δέ** is its difficulty. **γάρ** (which has greatly preponderating authority) gives the reason for the continuance of his joy.—**τοῦτο.** There is no need to limit this to his captivity (so Kl.), or his worries and trial (De W., Lft.). It is used generally of his present circumstances. **τοῦτο . . . σωτ.** is quoted from Job xiii. 16 (LXX).—**σωτ.** We fail to see why this should be interpreted as the final eschatological salvation (so Ws., Lft., Kl., etc.). There is nothing in the context to justify such a thought. He has every reason to hope, he tells them, that he will see them again in peace (vv. 25-27). Surely he is thinking chiefly of his probable release, an expectation which admirably accords with the favourable view of his case which was evidently being taken at Rome. This interpretation (Chr., **τὴν ἀπαλλαγὴν λέγει**) is strongly supported by the sense of the word in Job. xiii. 16, from which it is here quoted, where יְשׁוּעָה has not the usual deeper meaning which belongs to it in the Prophh. and Pss., but signifies

γίας τοῦ Πνεύματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 20. κατὰ τὴν [b] ἀποκαραδοκίαν καὶ ἐλπίδα μου, ὅτι ἐν οὐδενὶ αἰσχυνθήσομαι, ἀλλ' ἐν πάσῃ [c] παρρησίᾳ, ὡς πάντοτε, καὶ νῦν [d] μεγαλυνθήσεται Χριστὸς ἐν τῷ σώματί μου, εἴτε διὰ ζωῆς εἴτε διὰ θανάτου. 21. Ἐμοὶ γὰρ τὸ ζῆν,[1] Χριστός[2]· [e] καὶ

b Only parall. in Rom. viii. 19. See Fritzsche, *Opuscc.*, p. 150 ff.
c Acts iv. 13, xxviii. 31
et passim. d Luke i. 46; Acts xix. 17. e *Cf.* 2 Cor. v. 6.

[1] Prob. to be spelt thus in N.T. See W-Sch., i., § 5, 11, d.
[2] F, Ggr., d, e, f, vg. go. add εστιν.

victory in a contest for the right. *Cf.* also 2 Cor. i. 10 ff., a passage precisely akin to this, which favours the above idea of **σωτηρία.** [We find that Zahn uses almost the same arguments, Luthardt's *Zeitschr.*, 1885, p. 300.] This verse is linked to ver. 12 by ver. 18. He desires their prayers for deliverance, and the promised Spirit of Christ (Luke xii. 12) to give him wisdom that he may know how to act. In any case (the thought crosses his mind that he may still be condemned) he hopes to glorify Christ whether in life or death.—**ἐπιχορ.** The absence of the article is no reason for joining **ἐπιχ.** closely with **δεήσ.** under the government of **ὑμῶν.** The gen. **τοῦ πν. Ἰ. Χ.** is quite sufficient to isolate **ἐπιχ.** "The supply given by the Spirit of Jesus Christ." This is the Spirit possessed by Christ Himself and communicated to all who abide in Him as members of His body. Of course Paul, at times, really identifies Christ with the Spirit, *e.g.*, 1 Cor. xv. 45, 2 Cor. iii. 17. *Cf.* 1 Cor. vi. 17. This identification springs directly from his own spiritual history. "The first 'pneumatic' experience Paul had was an experience of Christ" (Gunkel, *Wirkungen d. heil. Geistes*[2], p. 91). *Cf.* for the word **ἐπιχορ.** *Ep. ad Diogn.*, i., 10, **τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ καὶ τὸ λέγειν καὶ τὸ ἀκούειν ἡμῖν χορηγοῦντος.** "A suitable and common word for the Giver God. . . . The generosity of its origin survives in the transfer" (Gildersleeve *ad loc.*).

Ver. 20. **ἀποκαραδ.** The concentrated intense hope which ignores other interests (**ἀπό**), and strains forward as with outstretched head (**κάρα, δοκεῖν**). *Cf.* Rom. viii. 19, **ἡ γὰρ ἀποκαραδοκία τῆς κτίσεως τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀπεκδέχεται.** The verb **ἀποκαραδοκεῖν** is found in Polyb., Plut., Joseph., Aquila. — **αἰσχυνθ.** very probably refers, in the main, to his own conduct, the danger of denying his Lord under stress of hardships, but there is also involved the thought of Christ's treatment of him. This gives the true antithesis to **μεγαλυνθ.**—**παρρησίᾳ.** We are inclined to believe that **π.** has its literal meaning, boldness of speech, for he has before him the danger of denying Christ. Of course there is implied the idea of courage in his whole bearing. The word is typical of the attitude of the early Christians.—**καὶ νῦν.** His trial is in process.—**μεγαλ. . . . θανάτου.** There is some force in Meyer's suggestion that passive verbs are used here because Paul feels himself the organ of Divine working. **ἐν τῷ σώμ.** "In my person." **σ.** in Paul is always a colourless word, the organ of the **ψυχή** or the **πνεῦμα,** and taking its character from its constituting principle. If he lives, it will be for the service of Christ, which is the highest honour he can pay his Lord. If he has to die, then his readiness to endure death and his calm courage in enduring will be the most eloquent testimony to the worth of his Lord.

Vv. 21-23. DEATH OR LIFE MEANS CHRIST FOR HIM.—Ver. 21. **ἐμοί.** Why this emphasis? He knew that, after the expression of his joyful confidence and hope, the word **θάνατος** would come as a shock to their minds. There could be no question as to how men in general felt concerning life and death. But *he*, the Apostle, occupies a different standpoint. This standpoint he must explain. In spite of Haupt's strong arguments for taking **τὸ ζῆν,** not as bodily life, but as life in its general conception (including the future existence), we cannot help feeling that the antithesis of **ζωῆς** and **θανάτου** (ver. 20) necessitates the same contrast between **τὸ ζῆν** and **τὸ ἀποθανεῖν.** [Kabisch, *Eschatologie d. Paulus*, p. 134, goes the length of saying that Paul does not know the conception of life as an ethical quality; that it always means for him simply *existence.* Probably there may be more truth in this than we are at first sight, from our different modes

f Gal. ii. 20; contrast Rom. viii. 12.
g See note *infr.*
h 1 Cor. xii. 3, xv. 1; Gal. i. 11 *al.*
i Luke xii. 50; *cf.* 2 Cor. v. 14.
k Appar. the only N.T. ex. of this constrn.
l Also in Luke xii. 36 = return. Noun in 2 Tim. iv. 6.

τὸ ἀποθανεῖν, κέρδος. 22. εἰ δὲ τὸ ζῆν ἐν [f] σαρκί, τοῦτό μοι καρπὸς [g] ἔργου[1]· καὶ τί αἱρήσομαι[2] οὐ [h] γνωρίζω. 23. [i] συνέχομαι γὰρ[3] ἐκ τῶν δύο, τὴν [k] ἐπιθυμίαν ἔχων εἰς[4] τὸ [l] ἀναλῦσαι καὶ σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι,

[1] FG, O.L. vg., Ireni$^{int.}$, Victorin., Ambrst., *al.* add **εστιν.** W.H. read **εργου,—.**

[2] B **αιρησωμαι.** Blass **τι αιρησομαι;** so W.H. mg.

[3] So some minn., Thdrt. Edd. **δε** with ℵABDEFGKLP, O.L. vg. go. syrp. æth. sah., Chr., Euth.$^{cod.}$, Victorin., Ambrst. Trg. **γαρ** in mg.

[4] DEFG om. **εις.**

of thought, inclined to admit. To the Jewish mind non-existence was certainly one of the most terrible ideas conceivable.] If life meant for Paul wealth, power, self-gratification and the like, then death would loom in front of him with terror. But life for *him* means Christ. He is one with his Lord. And he knows that death itself cannot break that union, it can only make it more complete (because death is **σὺν Χ. εἶναι,** ver. 23). Thus it must be actual gain, a definite addition to his joy. Contrast the thought of *Apoc. of Bar.*, xiv., 12, in some degree similar: "the righteous justly hope for the end, and without fear depart from this habitation, because they have with thee a store of works preserved in treasuries".—**κέρδος.** *Cf.* Wisd. iii. 2, **ἔδοξαν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἀφρόνων τεθνάναι, καὶ ἐλογίσθη κάκωσις ἡ ἔξοδος αὐτῶν, καὶ ἡ ἀφ' ἡμῶν πορεία σύντριμμα· οἱ δέ εἰσιν ἐν εἰρήνῃ.** In sharp contrast to Paul's statement, *cf.* Libanius, *Orat.*, xxvi., p. 595 A (quoted by Wetstein): **πάντως οἷς βαρὺ τὸ ζῆν κέρδος ὁ θάνατος.** See numerous apt illustrations in Wetstein.

Ver. 22. To show the diversities of interpretation to which this verse has given rise, it is enough to note that in the first clause Hpt. would supply **ζῆν ἐστιν,** while Ws. suggests **κέρδος.** Others regard the first two clauses as protasis (**τοῦτο** summing up the words preceding), making the apodosis begin with **καί.** The context suggests an explanation more simple and more natural. Paul has sought to convince them that death has no terror for him; that, on the contrary, it is pure gain. Yet he will not have them suppose that therefore life on earth (**ἐν σαρκί,** life with the encumbrance of sinful flesh) is a burden and a trouble. In the circumstances, as he points out immediately, it is probably best for him and them. And he will give a preliminary hint of this. Must we not supply **μοί ἐστι,** in thought, in the first clause? This is suggested both by **ἐμοί** preceding and by the **μοι** which follows. **ἐστί** has to be supplied, admittedly, in both clauses of ver. 21. There is no greater difficulty in doing so here. "But if life in the flesh be my portion, this means (so we must also translate the **ἐστί** supplied in first clause of ver. 21) for me fruit of (*i.e.*, springing from) labour." **τὸ ζῆν** is qualified by **ἐν σ.**, because the Apostle felt that he could not regard physical death as quenching his life. Death only meant fuller life, therefore he must define when he wishes to speak of life on this earth.—**καρπὸς ἔργου.** For the phrase see Ps. ciii. (civ.) 13, **ἀπὸ καρποῦ τῶν ἔργων σου χορτασθήσεται ἡ γῆ**; Wisd. iii. 15, **ἀγαθῶν γὰρ πόνων ὁ καρπὸς εὐκλεής.** Aptly Thphyl., **καὶ τὸ ζῆν ἐν σαρκὶ οὐκ ἄκαρπόν μοί ἐστιν· καρποφορῶ γὰρ διδάσκων καὶ φωτίζων πάντας.**—**τί αἱρήσ. τί** has practically ousted **πότερον** from N.T. It is quite natural to have the fut. indicat. in a deliberative sentence.—**γνωρίζω.** Its invariable meaning in N.T. = "make known". This sense suits almost every instance in LXX. So here, "I do not make known," "I cannot tell".

Ver. 23. **συνέχομαι δέ** (with most authorr.). **δέ** = "rather". *Cf.* Rom. iv. 20.—**συνέχ. ἐκ.** Apparently the idea is that of a strong pressure bearing upon him from (**ἐκ** the source) two sides and keeping him motionless.—**ἐπιθυμ. εἰς.** *Cf.* Thuc., iv., 81, **ἐπιθυμίαν ἐνεποίει τοῖς Ἀθην. συμμάχοις ἐς τοὺς Λακεδ.**—**ἀναλῦσαι.** Aor. of momentary action (see Burton, *MT.*, p. 50). Only here in N.T. in this sense. *Cf.* 2 Tim. iv. 6, **ἀνάλυσιν**; Philo, Flacc. *ad fin.*, **τὴν ἐκ τοῦ βίου τελευταίαν ἀνάλυσιν.** Frequent in LXX and late Greek = depart. In Polyb. it usually means *castra movere.*—**σὺν Χ. εἶναι.**

πολλῷ[1] μᾶλλον [m]κρεῖσσον· 24. τὸ δὲ [n]ἐπιμένειν ἐν[2] τῇ σαρκὶ ἀναγ- καιότερον δι' ὑμᾶς. 25. καὶ τοῦτο πεποιθὼς οἶδα ὅτι μενῶ καὶ [o]συμ- παραμενῶ[3] πᾶσιν ὑμῖν εἰς τὴν ὑμῶν [p]προκοπὴν καὶ χαρὰν τῆς πίστεως, 26. ἵνα τὸ [q]καύχημα ὑμῶν περισσεύῃ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἐν ἐμοί,[4] διὰ

m *Cf.* Mark vii. 36; 2 Cor. vii. 13.

n Used by P. literally and metaphor., *e.g.*, 1 Cor. xvi. 7 and Rom. xi. 23.

o With true text παραμενῶ, *cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 6.

p See ver. 12 *supr.*

q Characteristic of P., *e.g.*, Rom. iv. 2; 1 Cor. ix. 15, also 2 Cor. v. 12 in different sense.

[1] So ℵ*DEFGKLP, f, vg. go. syrr. arm. æth., Chr., Thdrt. Edd. add γαρ with ℵ[a]ABC 6, 10, 17, 31, Clem.[541], Euth.[cod.], Ambrst., Aug. Ws., *TK.*, p. 120, assigns the omission to carelessness. D*FG, d, e, Victorin. ποσω.

[2] So Alf., Trg., Myr., Ws. with BDEFGKL, Thdrt., Thphl., O.L. vg. Ti., W.H. om. εν with ℵACP, c, k, o, Clem., Or., Chr. Myr. thinks εν might easily have been absorbed by the final syllable of επιμενειν. Ws. supposes it was omitted on the analogy of pass. like Rom. vi. 1, Col. i. 23, where επιμ. has a different meaning.

[3] So Myr. with D[c]EKLP, Chr., Thdrt., Thphl. Edd. παραμενω with ℵABCD*FG 17, 20, 31, 67**, arm., Euth.[cod.]

[4] FG, f, g place εν Χ. Ι. after εν εμοι.

From this passage and 2 Cor. v. 8 (but see also 1 Thess. v. 10) as compared with others, *e.g.*, 1 Thess. iv. 15, 1 Cor. xv. 51, Beyschl. (*N.T. Theol.*, ii., 269 ff.), Teichmann (*op. cit.*, pp. 57-59), Grafe (*Abhandl. C. v. Weizsäcker gewidm.*, p. 276) and others conclude that the Apostle changed his views on eschatology in his later years, and esp. when death stared him in the face. Instead of supposing a sleep (**κοιμᾶσθαι**) until the Parousia, or else the direct experience of that event, he now believes that after death the soul is immediately united to Christ. It is, however, hazardous to build up eschatological theories on these isolated utterances of the Apostle. He has, apparently, no fixed scheme of thought on the subject. The Resurrection is not before his mind at all in this passage. His eschatology, as Dsm. (*Th. LZ.*, 1898, col. 14) well observes, must rather be conceived as **ἐλπίς**. Death cannot interrupt the life **ἐν Χριστῷ**. This is the preparation for being **σὺν Χ.** Even contemporary Jewish thought was familiar with a similar idea. So, *e.g.*, *Tanchuma*, *Wajjikra*, 8: "When the righteous leave the world they ascend at once and stand on high" (Weber, *Lehren d. Talmud*, p. 323). See also Charles, *Eschatology*, p. 399 ff.—**πολλῷ κ.τ.λ.** It seems necessary for the sense to insert **γάρ** with the best authorities. The double comparat. is fairly common.

Vv. 24-26. HIS PRESENTIMENT THAT HE WILL VISIT THEM AGAIN.—Ver. 24. **ἐπιμ.** seems common with Paul in a colourless sense.—**ἐν.** It is hard to decide whether it should be retained or not. No difference is made in the sense.—**ἀναγκ.** It is characteristic of the Apostle that the first thing which strikes him is the need of others. Wetstein quotes aptly from Seneca, *Epp. ad Lucil.*, p. 104, *ingentis animi est aliena causa ad vitam reverti quod magni viri saepe fecerunt.*

Ver. 25. **καὶ τ. π. οἶδα.** "With this conviction (*sc.*, that his life is needful for them) I know," etc. Paul does not claim to be infallible, but he is so confident of the Philippians' need of him that he cannot doubt that this will be God's purpose too. There is every reason to believe that his hope was justified (see *Introduction*).—**παραμενῶ** (which is best attested) has in later Greek the special sense of "remaining alive". See Schmid, *Atticismus*, i., p. 132, who quotes Dio., i., 62, 8; 333, 29; Herod., i., 30, and compares Plat., *Phaed.*, 62 E, 86 C.—**εἰς τ. ὑ. προκ. κ.τ.λ.** Probably **προκ.** should be taken apart from **πίστεως**, which goes closely with **χαράν**. "With a view to your progress and the joy of your faith." **ὥστε στηριχθῆναι μᾶλλον ὑμᾶς καθάπερ νεοττοὺς δεομένους τῆς μητρὸς ἕως ἂν αὐτοῖς παγῇ τὰ πτερά** (Chr.).

Ver. 26. "In order that your ground of glorying may increase in Christ Jesus through me, by reason of my," etc. Their **καύχημα** is their knowledge and possession of the Gospel. Christ Jesus is the sphere in which this blessing is enjoyed. *Cf.* Sirach ix. 16, **ἐν φόβῳ Κυρίου ἔστω τὸ καύχημά σου.—ἐν ἐμοί** is defined by the following clause. Paul looks on his presence with them as an occasion of advance in their Christian

τῆς ἐμῆς [r]παρουσίας πάλιν πρὸς ὑμᾶς. 27. Μόνον ἀξίως τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ Χριστοῦ [s]πολιτεύεσθε, ἵνα εἴτε ἐλθὼν καὶ ἰδὼν ὑμᾶς, εἴτε ἀπών, ἀκούσω[1] τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν, ὅτι [t]στήκετε ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι, μιᾷ ψυχῇ

r Usually in N.T. of Second Advent. Seldom as here.
s Acts xxiii. 1; 2 Macc. vi. 1.
t Chiefly in P., *e.g.*, 1 Cor. xvi. 13; 1 Thess. iii. 8.

[1] So Alf., Myr. (Lft. mg.) with ℵ[a]ACD[c]EFGKL, Chr., Euth.[cod.], Thdrt. Lach., Ti., W.H., Ws. ακουω with ℵ*BD*P 47, 57.

calling. **ἐν**, which here denotes strictly the *basis*, may be translated "through". This passage bears out the favourable turn which Paul's affairs have taken. He looks forward to rejoining them.

Vv. 27-30. Entreaty to live worthily of the Gospel in the face of conflicts.—Ver. 27. **μόνον** "gives the aim for which he wishes to remain alive" (Hfm.).—**ἀξίως . . . πολιτ.** For the whole phrase *cf. Inscrr. of Pergamon* (after 133 B.C.), Bd. ii., 496$_5$, [ἀ]ναστρεφομένην καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς καὶ ἀξίως τῆς πόλεως (Dsm., *NBS.*, p. 22). For **ἀξίως τ. εὐαγγ.** *cf. Inscrr. Perg.*, 521, of a priestess, ἱερασαμένην ἀξίως τῆς Θεοῦ καὶ τῆς πατρίδος (*op. cit.*, p. 75).—**πολιτεύεσθε.** In addition to reff. in marg., *cf.* Joseph., *Vit.*, 2; Paris *Papyr.*, 63, coll. 8, 9 (164 B.C.), in which a letter-writer claims for himself that he has **ὁσίως καὶ . . . δικαίως** [πολι]τευσάμενος before the gods (Dsm., *BS.*, p. 211); 1 Clem. *ad Cor.*, vi., 1. The word seems gradually to have lost its original sense of life in a community, and came to mean simply "live" or "behave". But probably a shade of its original significance often survives as here, to live as directed by certain regulations, certain laws. [Hort, *Christian Ecc.*, p. 137, would retain the strict sense, "live a community-life . . . one directed not by submission to statutes but by the inward power of the Spirit of fellowship".]—**ἀκούσω.** We should, of course, expect **ἀπὼν καὶ ἀκούσας** with some finite verb of knowing, but the Apostle, as so frequently, changes the expression of his thought in the process of its formation.—**στήκ. ἐν ἑ. πν.** Curiously enough, the second reference to citizenship (iii. 20) is followed by the same two verbs **στήκειν** and **συναθλεῖν** (so Gw.). This is the first direct exhortation to unity in the Epistle. Apparently there was a danger of friction. We have no reason to suppose that there had been serious divisions in the Philippian Church, but the case of Euodia and Syntyche (iv. 2) discloses perilous tendencies. This was not unnatural, for "the very energy of the Christian faith tended to produce energetic personalities" (Rainy, *Exp. B.*, p. 82). And so, apart from doctrinal differences altogether, divergences might arise on questions of method, organisation, etc., with serious consequences. The following words, **ἑνὶ πνεύματι**, viewed in the light of 1 Cor. xii. 9, 11, 13, suggest that the differences may have been due to a supposed superiority in spiritual endowments.—**ἑ. πνεύμ.** It is difficult to define precisely the Pauline idea of **πνεῦμα.** At times (*e.g.*, Rom. viii. 16) Paul speaks as if the Divine **πν.** and the human were two forces existing side by side, the Divine working upon the human. At others, the **πν.** in man seems to refer to the direct indwelling of the Spirit of God as the principle of new life imparted to man, *e.g.*, Rom. viii. 10. On the whole, we believe it is true to affirm that **πν.** in Paul is not a psychological but a religious term (so also Hpt. Kl. holds that Paul recognised a distinct **πν. τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.** Hltzm. would identify this with the **νοῦς.** *Cf.* Cone., *Paul*, pp. 326-327). Here we are safe in holding that **ἑνὶ πν.** refers to the common, spiritual life implanted in them by the direct working of the Holy Spirit. Certainly this is its most usual significance in Paul. See an instructive discussion in Holsten, *Paulin. Theol.*, p. 11, who shows that when Paul uses **πν.** to denote the *human* spirit, apart from Divine working, it is when he is obliged to emphasise it as the inner power which moves in the hidden life, or when he draws a sharp contrast between the inner and outer side of human nature, laying stress upon the former as the essential, in opposition to the senses which cannot truly know.—**μιᾷ ψυχῇ.** Apparently Chr. and Th. Mps., with the best ancient versions, join **μ. ψ.** with **στήκ.** The words denote the common feeling, the agreement of heart and mind which was the result of possession of the same Spirit. *Cf.* Acts iv. 32. Kl. well compares the sense

[u] συναθλοῦντες τῇ πίστει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, 28. καὶ μὴ [v] πτυρόμενοι ἐν μηδενὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀντικειμένων· ἥτις αὐτοῖς μέν ἐστιν[1] [w] ἔνδειξις ἀπωλείας, ὑμῖν δὲ[2] σωτηρίας, καὶ τοῦτο ἀπὸ Θεοῦ· 29. ὅτι ὑμῖν[3] [x] ἐχαρίσθη τὸ[4] ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, οὐ μόνον τὸ εἰς αὐτὸν πιστεύειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ πάσχειν· 30. τὸν αὐτὸν [y] ἀγῶνα ἔχοντες οἷον[5] εἴδετε[6] ἐν ἐμοί, καὶ νῦν ἀκούετε ἐν ἐμοί.

u Chap. iv. 3 (only other ex. in N.T.). v Only here in N.T. w Rom. iii. 25; 2 Cor. viii. 24; 2 Thess. ii. 5. x Acts iii. 14; 1 Cor. ii. 12; *cf.* Buttmann, *N.T. Gramm.*, p. 52. y 1 Tim. vi. 12 *al.*; *cf.* Wisd. iv. 2 (with Grimm's note).

[1] So KL, syrp., Thdrt., Dam. Ti., W.H., Ws., Alf. εστιν αυτοις with ℵABCD*FG 17, 61, d, e, f, g, go. arm.

[2] So DcEKL, f, vg. cop. go. æth., Chr., Thdrt., Ambrst. All edd. υμων δε with ℵABP 17, 31, 47, d, e, arm. syrp., Aug. ημιν δε C*Dgr.*Fgr.G 73, g, Victorin.

[3] A 35, 71 ημιν. [4] Om. το FG, 3, 68**, 73, 120, arm.

[5] και added by D*FG, d, e, f, g, Ambrst. C* inserts και after ειδετε.

[6] So edd. with ℵAB*CD*E* 17, Chr., Thdrt. ιδετε BcDcE**FGKLP, Clem., Euth.cod., Thphl.

of *camaraderie* which binds the soldiers of a country together. For an exhaustive discussion of ψυχή see Hatch, *Essays in Bibl. Greek*, pp. 101-109.—**συναθλ. τ. π.** A comparison with iv. 3 would suggest "striving along with the faith" (so Lft., Vau.). This is certainly harsh. The parallel in Jude 3, **ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ πίστει**, favours the sense, "striving together (συν) *for* the faith". *Conjungat vos evangelii fides, praesertim cum illa vobis sit communis armatura adversus eundem hostem* (Calvin).—**τῇ πίστ.** Christianity regarded in its most characteristic aspect as the acceptance of God's revelation of mercy in Christ, and the resting upon that for salvation. **ἡ πίστις** gradually becomes a technical term. See Hatch, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 314; Harnack, *Dogmengesch.*, i., p. 129 ff.

Ver. 28. **πτυρόμ.** is apparently used esp. of scared horses. So Diod. Sic., xvii., 34, 6, **διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν περὶ αὐτοὺς σωρευομένων νεκρῶν πτυρόμενοι.** It is found in Plut., *Reipub. Ger. Praec.*, p. 800, of a multitude. See Kypke *ad loc.*—**τ. ἀντικειμ.** Who are their adversaries? In ver. 30 he speaks of them as having the same conflict as *he* had when at Philippi and now has at Rome. In both these instances, most probably, his opponents were heathen. Further, when warning his readers against Jewish malice, what he usually fears is not that they will be terrified into compliance, but that they will be seduced from the right path. And, as Franke (Myr.[5] *ad loc.*) points out, the conflict here is for the **πίστις**, not for the **ἀλήθεια** of the Gospel. It is no argument against this that some of his reasoning would only have force for Jews, *e.g.*, suffering as a gift of God (so Holst., *Jahrb. f. prot. Th.*, 1875, p. 444). For he is speaking of the impression made upon them (the Philippians), and he uses Christian modes of expression. Probably therefore he thinks chiefly of their heathen antagonists, as, in any case, Jews seem to have formed a very small minority of the population. The pagans of Philippi, on the other hand, would struggle hard against a faith which condemned all idol-worship, for the extant remains at Philippi and in its neighbourhood show that they were an extraordinarily devout community. See esp. Heuzey et Daumet, *Mission Archéologique de Macédoine*, pp. iii., 84-86. At the same time we cannot exclude the possibility that he had non-Christian Jews in his mind as well.—**ἥτις.** "Inasmuch as this" (*sc.*, the fact of their not being terrified). The relative is, as frequently, attracted to its predicate. So **ἥτις**, agreeing with **ἐνδ.**, for **τοῦτο.** In the following words the true reading is **ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς.** That of *TR.* has arisen for the sake of symmetry with the succeeding clause.—**ἔνδειξις.** An Attic law-term. In N.T. only in Paul. Not found in LXX. It denotes proof obtained by an appeal to facts. See SH. on Rom. ii. 15.—**ἀπώλεια** has its usual Pauline antithesis **σωτηρία.** Paul has never defined **ἀπώλεια.**—All edd. read **ὑμῶν δέ.** Not only is it better attested (see crit. note), but it also deserves preference as being the harder reading and sufficient to explain

a 2 Cor. viii. 17; 1 Tim. iv. 13; Heb. xii. 5.

II. 1. Εἴ τις[1] οὖν [a]παράκλησις ἐν Χριστῷ, εἴ τι[2] [b]παραμύθιον ἀγάπης, εἴ τις [c]κοινωνία Πνεύματος, εἴ τινα[3] [d]σπλάγχνα καὶ [e]οἰκτιρ-

b See note *infr.* c 1 Cor. x. 16; 2 Cor. xiii. 13; Philm. 6 *al.* d See on chap. i. 8 *supr.* e *Cf.* esp. Col. iii. 12.

[1] τι Euth.cod. [2] τις D*L 17, 137.

[3] So Ws., Myr. with very few minn., Clem., Thdrt., Thphyl., O.L. (d, e, f, g, m), Victorin., Ambrst. τις Ti., Alf., W.H. with ℵABCDEFGKLP, *al.*, Chr.moscc, Euth.cod. τι 4, 18, 37, 46, 72, 74.

the other. It really includes **ὑμῖν**. The emphasis in Paul's mind changes from the persons to their destinies. It was quite natural to assimilate **ὑμῖν** to **αὐτοῖς** preceding. But there is also the thought that *they* (the adversaries) will be affected not only by the proof of their own destruction, but also by that of the Philippians' salvation.—**τοῦτο** seems to refer to **ἔνδειξις**. "If God be for us, who can be against us?"

Ver. 29. **ὅτι . . . ἐχαρίσθη**. We are inclined to join this clause immediately to **μὴ πτυρόμενοι** (so also Hpt.). The prospect of suffering was apt to terrify them. But when they view suffering in its true light, they will discover that it is a gift of God's grace (**ἐχαρ.**) instead of an evil.—**τὸ ὑπὲρ κ.τ.λ.** The Apostle intended to insert **πάσχειν** after **Χρ.**, but for a moment he pauses. To emphasise the real value of suffering for Christ's sake, he compares it with that which they all acknowledge as the crowning blessing of their lives, faith in Him. As to the form of the sentence, this is a favourite rhetorical device of Paul's. See J. Weiss, *Beiträge*, p. 11 *n.*—**οὐ μόνον. μή** might have been expected. "When a limitation of an infinitive or of its subject is to be negatived rather than the infinitive itself, the negative **οὐ** is used instead of **μή**. This principle applies esp. in the case of the adverb **μόνον**" (Burton, *MT.*, p. 183).—**εἰς αὐτόν**. The deepest aspect of faith, the intimate union into which the soul is brought.

Ver. 30. **ἀγῶνα**. For the fact, see Acts xvi. 19 ff. and *cf.* 1 Thess. ii. 2. The metaphor has been prepared for by **στήκετε** and **συναθλοῦντες**. *Cf.* Epictet., iv., 4, 32 (quoted by Hatch, *Hibb. Lects.*, p. 156), "Life is in reality an Olympic festival: we are God's athletes to whom He has given an opportunity of showing of what stuff we are made". **ἀγών** was constantly used in later Greek of an inward struggle. See some striking exx. from Plutarch in Holden's note on *Timoleon*, xxvii., § 5.—**ἔχοντες**. A broken construction. It ought strictly to be dative agreeing with **ὑμῖν**. It can scarcely be taken as parallel with **συναθλ.** and **πτυρ.**—**εἴδετε**. See reff. above.—**ἀκούετε**. His Roman trial.

CHAPTER II.—Vv. 1-4. EXHORTATION TO UNITY OF SPIRIT AND LOWLINESS.—Ver. 1. **εἴ τις κ.τ.λ.** "If exhortation in Christ, if the appeal of love, if fellowship in the spirit, if compassion and pity have any effect."—**οὖν** probably refers back to i. 27.—**παράκλησις** has the two senses of "exhortation" and "consolation". But the whole context, supported by such passages as Eph. iv. 1, 1 Cor. i. 10, is in favour of the former. No doubt the idea of encouragement and stimulus is implied. This is an exhortation in Christ. That itself must gain for it a favourable reception.—**παραμ.** Only here in N.T. Once in LXX, Wisd. iii. 18. Almost equiv. to **παράκλ.**, but having a suggestion of tenderness involved. It springs from his love towards them.—**κοιν. πνεύματος**. The community of believers is the body of Christ. The Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Christ, is the unifying Principle of life. *Cf.* 2 Cor. xiii. 13, **ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος**. As Gunkel well observes (*Wirkungen d. heil. Geistes bei Paulus*[2], p. 69 ff.), Paul rendered an unspeakable service to the Church by emphasising this conception. By so doing he saved the exuberant spiritual gifts of the Apostolic Age from degenerating into mere unnatural excitement. All these came to be estimated according to their value for the community of believers as a whole.—**τινα σπλάγχνα**. There can be no doubt that an overwhelming weight of authority lies on the side of the reading **τις. τινα** is simply an emendation. How can **τις** be accounted for? We had hit upon the conjecture that originally **τι** may have stood in all the clauses. (So Euth. reads before **παράκλησις**.) It would be quite natural that from a slight misunderstanding of its meaning it should be changed into **τις** before **παράκλ.** and **κοινωνία.** The **τι** before **σπλάγχνα** (found in several

μοί, 2. [f]πληρώσατέ μου τὴν χαράν, ἵνα [g]τὸ αὐτὸ [g]φρονῆτε, τὴν αὐτὴν [f] John iii. 29. For constrn. *cf.* John xv. 13; 1 Cor. iv. 3.
ἀγάπην ἔχοντες, [h]σύμψυχοι,[1] τὸ ἓν[2] φρονοῦντες· 3. μηδὲν κατὰ
[i]ἐριθείαν ἢ[3,4] [k]κενοδοξίαν, ἀλλὰ τῇ [l]ταπεινοφροσύνῃ ἀλλήλους ἡγού- [g] Chap. iv. 2; Rom. xii. 16, xv. 5; 2 Cor. xiii. 11. [h] Only here in N.T. [i] See note on i. 16. [k] Only here in N.T.; 4 Macc. ii. 15, viii. 19. [l] Not earlier than N.T.; Eph. iv. 2; Col. iii. 12 *al.* Jos., *B.J.*, 4, 9, 2, αἰτιαθεὶς ἐπὶ ταπ. = craven-heartedness.

[1] So Alf., Trg., Lach. with ℵBcDcEKLP. **συνψ.** Ti., W.H., Ws. with AB*CD*FG.

[2] So most edd. with ℵcBDFGKLP, d, e, g, syrr. arm. æth., Clem., Bas., Hil., Ambrst., Victorin. **το αυτο** W.H. (mg.) with ℵ*AC 17, 73, vg. go., Euth.cod.

[3] So Myr. with Dgr.Egr.FGKLP, f, g, syrr. go., Chr., Thdrt., Hil. Edd. **μηδε** with ℵABC 17, 31, 37, 116, d, e, m, vg. cop. arm. æth., Euth.cod., Victorin., Aug., Ambrst.

[4] Om. **κατα** TR., Myr. with ℵcDEFGKLP, f, g, go., Bas., Chr., Thdrt. Edd. **κατα** with ℵ*ABC 17, 31, 37, 116, d, e, m, vg. cop. syrr. arm., Euth.cod., Vict., Hil., Aug., Ambrst.

minn., including 37) might easily assimilate the following **σ**. At this stage the type of text found in the leading uncials happened to arise. And so the error was stereotyped, although corrected later by Greek Fathers. Curiously enough this same conjecture has been made by Hpt. We do not overlook the difficulties involved, but allow it to stand for want of anything better.—**σπλάγχνα.** See on i. 8. He appeals to their pity.

Ver. 2. *Semper in discordiis aperta est janua Satanae ad spargendas impias doctrinas, ad quas repellendas optima munitio est consensus* (Calv.).—**πληρ. . . . ἵνα.** The **ἵνα** clause seems exactly = Latin *gerund*. *Cf.* an infinitive used in the same way in Acts xv. 10, **τί πειράζετε τὸν Θεὸν ἐπιθεῖναι κ.τ.λ.**, also Polyc., *Martyr.*, x., 1 (quoted by Burton, *MT.*, p. 92). **ἵνα** is probably "hypotelic" as Ell. (on Eph. i. 17) terms it, *i.e.*, "the subject of the wish is blended with and even (at times) obscures the purpose".—**τὸ α. φρον.** The general description of agreement which is analysed and defined in the succeeding clauses. Perhaps a common phrase in popular language. See *Sepulchr. Inscr.* (Rhodes, 2nd cent. B.C.), of a married couple, **ταὐτὰ λέγοντες ταὐτὰ φρονοῦντες ἤλθομεν τὰν ἀμέτρητον ὁδὸν εἰς Ἀΐδαν** (Dsm., *NBS.*, p. 84).—**τ. αὐτ. ἀγ.** The same feelings.—**σύμψ.** The same point of view in their common interests.—**τὸ ἕν** expresses the one concrete aim of their views, perhaps with special reference to the unity of the Church (so Lips.). Minute distinctions, however, must not be forced, as there is doubtless here much of what Vaughan terms "the tautology of earnestness".

Ver. 3. **μηδέν.** Probably, *sc.*, **φρονοῦντες,** although no addition is necessary. This is the prevalent thought in the Apostle's mind.—**ἐριθείαν.** It is no wonder that Paul should warn against this danger, seeing it was one of his most grievous vexations at Rome.—**ἤ.** Read with best authorities **μηδὲ κατά** (see crit. note).—**κενοδ.** Only here in N.T. Three times in LXX. Combined with **ἀλαζονεία** and **μεγαλαυχία.** The boastful expression of pride. Egotism and boastfulness were apparently the perils besetting the Philippian Church. These were natural excrescences of the zealous spirit which pervaded this community. It is a strange phenomenon in religious history that intense earnestness so frequently breeds a spirit mingled of censoriousness and conceit.—**τῇ ταπεινοφρ.** The construction seems exactly parallel to Rom. xi. 20, **τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ ἐξεκλάσθησαν** = "on account of," "by reason of". Perhaps the article emphasises the generic idea (so Myr.). **ταπεινός** with derivatives, used in classical writers to denote a mean condition of self-debasement, had been already exalted by Plato and his school to describe that state of mind which submits to the Divine order of the universe and does not impiously exalt itself. It underwent a further stage of development in Christian literature, when it came to signify the spirit which most resembles that of Christ Himself. See an instructive note in Moule (*CT. ad loc.*).

Ver. 4. The authorities are pretty evenly balanced in the case of the alternative readings **ἕκαστος** and **ἕκαστοι** (see crit. note). Probably edd. are right in

m Chap. iii. 8, iv. 7.

μενοι [m] ὑπερέχοντας ἑαυτῶν· 4. μὴ τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἕκαστος[1] σκοπεῖτε,[2] ἀλλὰ καὶ[3] τὰ ἑτέρων ἕκαστος.[4] 5. τοῦτο γὰρ[5] φρονείσθω[6] ἐν ὑμῖν ὃ

[1] So ℵCDEKLP, d, e, go. syrr., Bas., Ephr., Chr., Thdrt., Hil., Victorin., Ambrst. Edd. (Trg., W.H. mg.) εκαστοι with ABFG 17, 116, f, g, m, vg., Bas., Euth.cod., Amb.

[2] So L, Chr., Thdrt., Dam. Edd. σκοπουντες with ℵABCDEFGP, d, e, f, g, m, vg. go. arm. Bas., Euth.cod., Hil., Ambrst.

[3] Om. και D*FGK 61, d, e, f, g, m, vg., Victorin., Ambrst., *al.*

[4] So KL, d, go. syrr. arm., Chr., Thdrt., Dam. Edd. εκαστοι with ℵABC$^{vi.}$Dgr. Egr.P 17, 31, 47, cop. Bas., Euth.cod., Victorin., Aug. Om. FG, f, g, m, vg. æth., Ambrst. ℵ*AC 17, Cyr. join εκαστοι to following words. So W.H. mg.

[5] So Myr. with ℵ^{c}DEFGKLP, d, e, f, g, m, go. syrp., Chr., Thdrt., Hil., Victorin., Ambrst. Om. γαρ edd. with ℵ*ABC 17, 37, 73, k$^{scr.}$, cop. arm. æth., Euth.cod. Myr. holds that γαρ came to be omitted because the preceding εκαστοι (ver. 4) with the reading φρονειτε (ver. 5) was supposed to begin a new sentence.

[6] So Myr. with C^{3}KLP, cop. arm. go., Or., Eus., Ath., Bas., Chr., Thdrt. Edd. φρονειτε with ℵABC*DEFG 17, 67**, d, e, f, g, m, vg. syrr., Euth.cod., Cyr., Victorin., Ambrst. Myr. retains φρονεισθω as the harder reading.

preferring the latter, both on account of the variety of its witnesses and its aptness in the context. Besides, as the more difficult, it would be very liable to correction. **σκοποῦντες** has overwhelming authority in its favour. "No party having an eye for its own interests alone but also for those of the rest." **ἕκαστοι** (frequent in this sense in classical Greek) = each group, each combination.—**ἑτέρων.** Used with strict correctness as opposed to **ἑαυτῶν.** It often has a less strict usage in N.T. From the gentle way in which he deals with them, we cannot suppose that there was as yet any serious rent in the Philippian Church. Probably he has already in mind the party feeling roused by the disagreement between Euodia and Syntyche. The opinion of the Christian community was divided. This might, of course, lead to serious issues. He has already implored them to be of the same mind (ver. 2). The way of reaching this harmony is unselfishness. "Paul's ethic is at least as much a social as an individual ethic" (Hltzm., *N.T. Th.*, ii., 162. Instructive discussion).

Vv. 5-11. THE CONDESCENSION AND EXALTATION OF CHRIST. As to form, vv. 5-10 appear to be constructed in carefully chosen groups of parallel clauses, having an impressive rhythm (see J. Weiss, *Beitr.*, pp. 28-29).—Ver. 5. **γάρ** ought probably to be rejected with the best group of MSS. **φρονείσθω,** as the harder reading, has much in its favour, but **φρονεῖτε** is far better attested. **τοῦτο φρονεῖτε κ.τ.λ.** The ordinary translation runs, "Have this mind in you which was also in Christ Jesus". This means the supplying either of **ἐφρονεῖτο (ἐφρονήθη)** or **ἦν** in the latter half of the verse after **ὅ.** Certainly any past tense (passive) of **φρονέω** is not only very harsh, but, when analysed, yields no appropiate sense. **ἦν** is scarcely less harsh, for it would presuppose **τοῦτο φρονεῖν** (not **τοῦτο** alone) as the antecedent of **ὅ.** Deissmann (following Hfm.) supplies **φρονεῖτε** (*cf.* parallel construction in 2 Tim. i. 5), and translates, "Have this mind within your community (so also Hoelemann) which ye have also in Christ Jesus". This keeps the local meaning with both occurrences of **ἐν** (for we have here the common Pauline phrase **ἐν Χ. Ἰ.** as the sphere of the Christian life). It gives a vivid force to **καί.** It gets rid of the apparently superfluous use of **ἐν ὑμῖν** after **φρονεῖτε.** And **φρονεῖτε** is, of course, the easiest word to supply. The sense is thoroughly apt. Christians then, as now, were often different in their ordinary dealings and relations from what they were in their strictly Christian life. The two spheres were at times kept distinct. Those who professed to have made great sacrifices for the sake of Christ might never dream of making even the slightest for a brother. The keenest zeal may be displayed in religious work, accompanied by singular laxity of principle in the common concerns of daily business and social intercourse. At first sight the interpretation, perhaps, repels by its unfamiliarity. But it appears less difficult than the other possible expositions.

[n] καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, 6. ὃς ἐν [o] μορφῇ Θεοῦ [p] ὑπάρχων, οὐχ [q] ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι [r] ἴσα [1] Θεῷ, ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν [s] ἐκένωσε, 7. μορφὴν

n *Cf.* 2 Tim. i. 5 *ad fin.*
o See note *infr.*
p 1 Cor. xi. 7; Gal. ii. 14 (appar. same force). Extraord. common in Acts, often in seemingly colourless sense.
q See note *infr.*
r Job xi. 12, xxx. 19.
s Rom. iv. 14; 1 Cor. i. 17, ix. 15; 2 Cor. ix. 3 (= make of no effect). Jer. xiv. 2, xv. 9 (transl. Heb. word = languish).

[1] So Trg. ἴσα Ti., Alf., W.H., Ws. Prob. the latter is more correct. The circumflex is, in all likelihood, an assimilation to the Epic language. See W-Sch., i., 68-69.

For Lft. and Vinc. practically ignore the difficulty, the former taking ἐφρονεῖτο = ὃ καὶ Χ. Ἰ. ἐφρόνει ἐν ἑαυτῷ. But that begs the question. Kl. thinks it impossible to separate the two spheres. (See Dsm., *Das N.T. Formel*, etc., p. 113 ff.; also Zahn, *Luthardt's Zeitschr.*, 1885, p. 243, who quotes with approbation Victorinus *ad loc.*, *Hoc sentite in vobis quod sentitis in Christo.*) [O. Hain, *SK.*, 1893, pp. 169-171, following the same lines, takes the second φρονεῖτε = imperat. "As indeed ye must have in Christ Jesus." This is difficult to arrive at.]— ἐν ὑμῖν. Correct N.T. writers would usually employ ἑαυτοῖς. Classical authors use ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς.

Vv. 6-11. In the discussion of this *crux interpretum* it is impossible, within our limits, to do more than give a brief outline of the chief legitimate interpretations, laying special emphasis on that which we prefer and giving our reasons. As regards literature, a good account of the older exegesis is given by Tholuck, *Disputatio Christologica*, pp. 2-10. Franke (in Meyer[5]) gives a very full list of modern discussions. In addition to commentaries and the various works on Biblical Theology, the following discussions are specially important: Rabiger, *De Christologia Paulina*, pp. 76-85; R. Schmidt, *Paulinische Christologie*, p. 163 ff.; W. Grimm, *Zw. Th.*, xvi., 1, p. 33 ff.; Hilgenfeld, *ibid.*, xxvii., 4, p. 498 ff.; W. Weiffenbach, *Zur Auslegung d. Stelle Phil.*, ii. 5-11 (Karlsruhe, 1884); E. H. Gifford, *Expositor*, v., vol. 4, p. 161 ff., 241 ff. [since published separately]; Somerville, *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, p. 188 ff. It may be useful to note certain cautions which must be observed if the Apostle's thought is to be truly grasped. (*a*) This is not a discussion in technical theology. Paul does not speculate on the great problems of the nature of Christ. The elaborate theories reared on this passage and designated "kenotic" would probably have surprised the Apostle. Paul is dealing with a question of practical ethics, the marvellous condescension and unselfishness of Christ, and he brings into view the several stages in this process as facts of history either presented to men's experience or else inferred from it. [At the same time, as J. Weiss notes (*Th. LZ.*, 1899, col. 263), the careful rhetorical structure of the passage (two strophes of four lines) shows that the thought has been patiently elaborated.] (*b*) It is beside the mark to apply the canons of philosophic terminology to the Apostle's language. Much trouble would be saved if interpreters instead of minutely investigating the refinements of Greek metaphysics, on the assumption that they are present here, were to ask themselves, "What other terms could the Apostle have used to express his conceptions?" (*c*) It is futile to attempt to make Paul's thought in this passage fit in with any definite and systematic scheme of Christology such as the "Heavenly Man," etc. This only hampers interpretation.

Ver. 6. ὅς. The discussions as to whether this refers to the pre-existing or historical Christ seem scarcely relevant to Paul's thought. For him his Lord's career was one and undivided. To suggest that he did not conceive a pre-existence in heaven is to ignore the very foundations of his thinking. Probably he never speculated minutely on the nature of Christ's pre-existent state, just as he refrains from doing so on the nature of the future life. He contents himself with general lines. The interpretation of the passage depends on the meaning assigned to (1) μορφή, (2) ἁρπαγμός, (3) τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ.— In LXX μορφή denotes the form, appearance, look or likeness of some one, that by which those beholding him would judge him. See Job iv. 16, Dan. v. 6 and three other places, Wisd. xviii. 1, 4 Macc. xv. 4. Plainly, from the context of these passages, the word had come, in later Greek, to receive a vague, general meaning, far removed from the accurate, metaphysical content which belonged to it in writers like Plato and Aristotle. It seems, therefore, to us of little value, with Lft. and Gifford (*op.*

t Rom. i. 23, viii. 3. LXX. u 1 Cor. vii. 31.

δούλου λαβών, ἐν [t]ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος· 8. καὶ [u]σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος, [v]ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτόν, γενόμενος [w]ὑπήκοος

v Matt. xviii. 4, xxiii. 12; 2 Cor. xi. 7 *al.* w Acts vii. 39; 2 Cor. ii. 9.

cit.), to discuss the relation of **μορφή** to terms such as **οὐσία, φύσις** and **εἶδος** in their philosophical refinements. It is far more probable that Paul uses **μορφ.** here "in a loose, popular sense, as we use 'nature'" (*Guardian*, Jan. 1, 1896). He means, of course, in the strictest sense that the pre-existing Christ was Divine. For **μ.** always signifies a form which truly and fully expresses the being which underlies it. But in trying to reach a conception of the pre-existing nature of his Lord, he is content to think of Him as the **εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ** (Col. i. 15), as sharing in that **δόξα** (on the close relation of **μ.** and **δόξα** see Nestle, *SK.*, 1893, pp. 173, 174) which is the manifestation of the Divine nature (*cf.* John xvii. 5, Heb. i. 3), as possessing, that is to say, the same kind of existence as God possesses, without indulging in speculations on the metaphysical relationship of the Son to the Father. So in 2 Cor. viii. 9 (the closest parallel in thought to this) he describes the same condition by the words **πλούσιος ὤν.** And this reminds us of the point of emphasis, the unspeakable contrast between the heavenly and earthly states, the **μ. Θεοῦ** and the **μ. δούλου.** The Apostle's mind is overpowered by the profound ethical meaning and value of the Humiliation.—**ὑπάρχων.** Probably = "being constitutionally" (Evans on 1 Cor. xi. 7), "being by nature". *Cf. Liturgy of S. James* (Hammond, *Litt.*, p. 45, quoted by Giff.), **παιδίον γέγονεν ὁ πρὸ αἰώνων ὑπάρχων Θεὸς ἡμῶν.** At the same time, in later Greek, it is often a mere copula. *Cf.* Gildersleeve on Justin M., *Apol.*, i., 2. This participle represents the imperfect as well as the present tense. So probably here.—**ἁρπαγμόν.** In the absence of relevant evidence for this word, its precise significance must largely be determined by the context. Accordingly it must be discussed in close connection with **τὸ εἶν. ἴσα Θ.** "Did not consider **τὸ ε. ἰ. Θ.** as an **ἁρπαγμός.**" What is the relation of **τὸ ε. ἰ. Θ.** to **μορφή**? The words mean "the being on an equality with God" (R.V.). It is surely needless to make any fine distinctions here, as Giff. does (*op. cit.*, p. 242), between **εἶναι ἴσος** as = equality of nature and **εἶναι ἴσα** as pointing to "the state and circumstances which are separable from the essence and therefore variable or accidental," or, with Lft., to say that **ἴσος** would refer to the person, while **ἴσα** has in view the attributes. As a matter of fact the adverb **ἴσα** (neuter plural) is used in the most general sense, without any metaphysical subtleties, *e.g.*, Job. xi. 12, **ἄνθρωπος δὲ ἄλλως νήχεται λόγοις· βροτὸς δὲ γεννητὸς γυναικὸς ἴσα ὄνῳ ἐρημίτῃ**; xxx. 19, **ἤγησαι δέ με ἴσα πηλῷ, ἐν γῇ καὶ σποδῷ μου ἡ μερίς.** *Cf.* Thuc., iii., 14, **ἴσα καὶ ἱκέται ἐσμέν**; Soph., *Oed. R.*, 1188, **ὑμᾶς ἴσα καὶ τὸ μηδὲν ζώσας ἐναριθμῶ,** and elsewhere. Thus no theological speculations can be based upon the word. Is **τὸ ε. ἰ. Θ.** equivalent to **ἐν μ. Θ.**? In spite of some Comm. there is absolutely nothing in the text to justify the supposition. Plainly **μορφή** has reference to *nature*; **τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ** to a relation. In fact it is only a particular rendering of **ἁρπαγμός** which suggested their equivalence. A more important question is whether **τὸ ε. ἰ. Θ.** was possessed by Christ in virtue of His being **ἐν μορ. Θεοῦ.** This will depend on the sense of **ἁρπαγμός.** It is generally admitted now that **ἁρπαγμός** may be regarded as = **ἅρπαγμα.** (See esp. Zahn, *Luthardt's Zeitschr.*, 1885, pp. 244-249.) *Cf.* **θεσμός,** lit. = "the laying down," "ordaining" of a thing, which comes to mean "the thing laid down," the ordinance or statute; **ἱλασμός,** lit. = a propitiating, appeasing, but usually the propitiatory offering, that by which propitiation is made (see Hatz., *Einl.*, p. 180). Myr., Hfm., Beet and others wish to keep the active meaning, and translate, "Did not consider the being on an equality with God as a means of robbing". But it seems impossible to accept this sense when we have no hint of what is to be robbed. Lft., Hpt., Vinc. and others, regarding **ἁρπαγμός** as = **ἅρπαγμα,** translate, "Did not look upon His equality with God as a prize to be clutched". That is to say, **τὸ ε. ἰ. Θ.** is something which He already possessed and resolved not to cling to. But will **ἁρπαγμός** admit of this meaning? We cannot find any passage where **ἁρπάζω** or any of its derivatives has the sense of "holding in possession," "retaining". It seems invariably to mean "*seize*," "*snatch violently*". Thus it is not permissible to glide from the true sense "grasp at" into one which is totally dif-

ferent, "hold fast". Are we not obliged, then, to think of the **ἁρπαγμός** (= **ἅρπαγμα**) as something still future, a *res rapienda*? *Cf.* *Catena* on Mark x. 41 ff. (quoted by Zahn), Jesus' answer to the sons of Zebedee, **οὐκ ἐστὶν ἁρπαγμὸς ἡ τιμή**, "the honour is not one to be snatched". Observe how aptly this view fits the context. In ver. 10, which is the climax of the whole passage, we read that God gave Jesus Christ *as a gift* (**ἐχαρίσατο**) the name above every name, *i.e.*, the name (including position, dignity and authority) of **Κύριος**, Lord, the name which represents the O.T. Jehovah. But this is the highest place Christ has reached. He has always (in Paul's view) shared in the Divine nature (**μ. Θεοῦ**). But it is only as the result of His Incarnation, Atonement, Resurrection and Exaltation that He *appears to men* as on an equality with God, that He is *worshipped by them* in the way in which Jehovah is worshipped. This position of **Κύριος** is the reward and crowning-point of the whole process of His voluntary Humiliation. It is the equivalent of that **τελείωσις** of which the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks. This perfection "He acquired as He successively seized the occasions which His vocation as author of salvation presented to Him, a process moving on the lines of His relations to mortal, sinful men" (Davidson, *Hebrews*, p. 208). Along the same lines ¦He was raised to the dignity of **Κύριος**, which is a relation to mankind. (See on the relation of Christ as **Κύριος** to God, Somerville, *op. cit.*, pp. 140-142.) This equality with God, therefore, consists in the **κυριότης**, the Lordship to which He has been exalted. "*He did not regard the being on an equality with God as a thing to be seized, violently snatched.*" *Cf.* Heliodor., *Ethiop.*, vii., 20, **οὐχ ἅρπαγμα οὐδὲ ἔρμαιον ἡγεῖται τὸ πρᾶγμα.** He might have used the miraculous powers inherent in His Divine nature in such a way as to compel men, without further ado, to worship Him as God. Instead of that He was willing to attain this high dignity by the path of humiliation, suffering and death. Is not this interpretation strongly corroborated by the narrative of the Temptation? In that mysterious experience our Lord was tempted to reach **τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ** in the way of **ἁρπάζειν**, forcing men out of sheer amazement to accept His claim and exalt Him as Lord. [Perhaps the curious negative expression **οὐχ ἁρπαγμ. κ.τ.λ.** has been suggested by a comparison with the first Adam who sought to reach "equality with God" by means of **ἁρπάζειν**.] It is to be noted that the increased glory which Paul and all the N.T. writers regard as pertaining to Christ after His Resurrection has only to do with His dignity, His "theocratic position," not with His essential personality. (*Cf.* Ménégoz, *Le Péché et la Rédemption*, p. 164.) He has simply become **ἐν δυνάμει**, that which He already was substantially. *Cf.* Rom. i. 4, **τοῦ ὁρισθέντος υἱοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει, κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης, ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν.** Also Luke xxiv. 26.—**ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε.** Instead of appearing among men in the Divine **μορφή** and thus compelling them to render Him the homage which was His due, He "emptied Himself" of that Divine **μορφή** and took the **μ.** of a bond-servant. The Apostle does not specify that of which He emptied Himself, as the stress is laid upon the "emptying," but with **μορ. δούλου λαβών** added to explain what **ἐκένωσε** means, we are bound to conclude that he has in view its antithesis, **μ. Θεοῦ.** (So also Myr., Hfm., Alf., Weiffenb., Hpt., Bruce, Gore, etc. Fairbairn, *Christ in Mod. Theol.*, pp. 476-477, tries to show that Christ emptied Himself of the "physical attributes" of Deity while retaining the "ethical". But does this lead us any nearer a solution of the mystery in the depths of the Son's personality?)

Ver. 7. A question arises as to punctuation. W.H. punctuate as in the text. Calvin, Weiffenb. and Hpt. would place a comma after **γενόμ.** and a colon after **ἄνθρωπος** of ver. 8. This would coordinate these three clauses and make a new sentence begin with **ἐταπείνωσεν.** The division does not seem natural or necessary.—**μ. δούλου λ.** The clause defines **ἐκένωσε.** Christ's assumption of the "form" of a **δοῦλος** does not imply that the innermost basis of His personality, His "ego," was changed, although, indeed, "there was more in this emptying of Himself than we can think or say" (Rainy, *op. cit.*, p. 119). **δ.** simply describes the humility to which He condescended. It is needless to ask whose **δοῦλος** He became. The question is not before the Apostle.—**ἐν ὁμοιώ. ἀνθ. γεν. γεν.** as opposed to **ὑπάρχων**, "becoming" as opposed to "being by nature". This clause, in turn, defines **μ. δ. λ.** "Being made in the likeness of men." **ὁμοι.** expresses with great accuracy the Apostle's idea. Christ walked this earth in the *real* likeness of

x Heb. xii. 4; 2 Tim. ii. 9; 2 Macc. xiii. 14 (ἀγωνισασθαι μέχρι θανάτου). y Only here in N.T.; Ps. xcvi. 9.

x μέχρι[1] θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ.[2] 9. διὸ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν y ὑπερύψωσε, καὶ ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ ὄνομα[3] τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα·

[1] αχρι D*FG. [2] του σταυρου ℵ.

[3] So DEFGKLP, arm., Thdrt., Or., Eus., Ath., Epiph., Chr., Euth.cod. Edd. add το with ℵABC 17, Hipp., Dion.alex., Eus.bis (Alf. brackets το).

men. This was no mere phantom, no mere incomplete copy of humanity. And yet Paul feels that it did not express the whole of Christ's nature. It was not "an hereditary likeness of being" (Hltzm. See *N.T. Th.*, ii., pp. 70-72). It was, in a sense, borrowed. — **ἀνθρ.** Almost = "mankind," "humanity".

Ver. 8. **καί** seems to introduce a break. The Apostle goes on to describe the depth of the self-renunciation. No doubt there is here especially before Paul's mind the contrast between what Christ "*is* in Himself and what He *appeared* in the eyes of men" (Lft.).—**σχήμ.** = Lat. *habitus*, the external bearing or fashion, "the transitory quality of our materiality" (Gore). — **εὑρεθείς.** Each word in the description emphasises the outward semblance. "Being found, discovered to be." The verdict of his fellow-creatures upon Him. They classed Him as an **ἄνθρωπος.** His outward guise was altogether human.—**ἐταπ.** Even as man He endured great humiliation, for He suffered the shameful death of the Cross. For surely **ἐταπ.** is more than a vivid, lively way of expressing **ἐκέν.** (as Weiffenb., *op. cit.*, p. 42). The rest of the verse depicts His humiliation. That consists in His obedience and the terrible issue to which it led. As obedient, He gave Himself wholly up to His Father's will. And the course of following that will led as far as (**μέχρι**) death itself, no ordinary death (**δέ** bringing into prominence the special nature of it, *cf.* Rom. iii. 22, ix. 30), but a death of shame and suffering. *Cf.* Cic., *pro Rabir.*, v., 10 (quoted by Moule): *Mors si proponitur, in libertate moriamur . . . nomen ipsum crucis absit non modo a corpore civium Romanorum sed etiam a cogitatione, oculis, auribus.* This would come home with force to the minds of the Philippians who enjoyed the *jus Italicum*.

Ver. 9. **διὸ . . . καί.** On account of His great renunciation and obedience. An exemplification of His own maxim: "He that humbleth himself shall be exalted". **καί** marks the correspondence between His lowliness and God's exaltation of Him.—**ὑπερύψ.** This goes back beyond the **ἐταπείν.** to the **ἐκέν.** (So Kl.) It reminds them that Christ has reached a position, in a certain sense, higher than that which He occupied **ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ.** This has nothing to do with His nature. The Divine glory which he always possessed can never be enhanced. But now, in the eyes of men and as claiming their homage, He is on an equality with God. *Cf.* the realistic description of the exaltation in *Sheph. of Hermas* (quoted by Taylor, *Sayings of Jew. Fathers*, p. 167), *Sim.*, ix., 6, 1, **ἀνήρ τις ὑψηλὸς τῷ μεγέθει ὥστε τὸν πύργον ὑπερέχειν.** Also *Gospel of Peter*, 10, with Robinson's notes. —**ἐχαρίσατο.** "Gave as a gift." This is the Father's prerogative, for undoubtedly the N.T. teaches a certain subordination of the Son. *Cf.* John xiv. 28, Rom. i. 3-4, 1 Cor. viii. 6, and, most memorable of all, 1 Cor. xv. 28, where the Son, having accomplished His work, seems, according to the Apostle's view, to recede, as it were, into the depths of the Divine Unity. —**ὄνομα. τὸ ὄν.** should be read with the best MSS. It is quite possible that the last syllable of **ἐχαρίσατο** occasioned the omission of the article. To what does **ὄνομα** refer? It is only necessary to read on, and the answer presents itself. The universal outburst of worship proclaims that Jesus Christ is **Κύριος,** Lord, the equiv. of O.T. Jehovah, the highest title that can be uttered. The full significance of the name will only be realised when all the world acknowledges the sovereignty of Christ. As J. Weiss notes (*Nachfolge Christi*, pp. 63-64), this is not a specially Pauline conception, but belongs to the general faith of the Church. [It is amazing how Alf., De W. and Ead. can refer it to "Jesus," Myr. and Vinc. to "Jesus Christ," while Lft. and Hpt. regard it as = "dignity," "title," without specifying.] On the whole conception *cf.* Heb. i., esp. vv. 3-4. Perhaps the Apostle has in his mind the Jewish use of הַשֵּׁם, "the Name," as a reverent substitute for יְהוָה (LXX **Κύριος**), Jehovah. *Cf. Sayings of Jew. Fathers* (ed. Taylor), iv., 7, and *Additional Notes*, pp. 165-167,

10. ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ[1] πᾶν γόνυ [z]κάμψῃ[2] [a]ἐπουρανίων καὶ [a]ἐπιγείων καὶ [b]καταχθονίων, 11. καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα [c]ἐξομολογήσηται[3] ὅτι Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός,[4] εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ πατρός.

z Eph. iii. 14; Isa. xlv. 23.
a *E.g.*, 1 Cor. xv. 40.
b Only here in N.T.
c Perhaps closest parallels are Matt. xi. 25; Luke x. 21; Ps. liii. 8.

[1] **Χριστου** added by ℵ* 47, 73, 114, 115, Or., Chr., Cyr., Marc. [2] **καμψει** P.

[3] So Lach., Trg. (§), Ws., W.H. with ℵB, Ir., Clem., Thdrt., Eus., Ath., Cyr. Ti., Alf., Myr. **-γησεται** with ACDEFGKLP, Or., Chr., Euth.cod. Ws., *TK.*, 46, speaks doubtfully. The subjunct. may be an assimilation to **καμψῃ**, but, on the other hand, the indic. comes from Isa. xlv. 23. It is unsafe to decide, as **ε** and **η** in the post-classical period were often interchanged. See W-Sch., p. 48.

[4] Om. **Χ.** Fgr.G, g, m, Eus., Novat., Hil.

where Taylor compares with vv. 7-8 of our chap., Isa. liii. 12 and with ver. 9, Isa. lii. 13. Most appropriate to our passage is his quotation from Jeremy Taylor (*Works*, vol. ii., p. 72): "He hath changed the ineffable name into a name utterable by man, and desirable by all the world; the majesty is all arrayed in robes of mercy, the tetragrammaton or adorable mystery of the patriarchs is made fit for pronunciation and expression when it becometh the name of the Lord's Christ".—**τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα.** *Cf.* 1 Pet. iii. 22, "Angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto Him"; Eph. i. 21.

Ver. 10. **ἐν τῷ ὀνόμ. Ἰ.** Perhaps the best explanation is that of Weiffenb. (*op. cit.*, p. 51), "On the ground of this name (**Κύριος**)," *i.e.*, because of what it means for every worshipper. Of course, the worship is rendered to Him as Lord. Abbott (*Notes on St. Paul's Epistles*, p. 93) compares Ps. lxiii. 4, "Thus will I bless Thee while I live: I will lift up my hands in Thy name". *Cf.* also Ps. xx. 5, liv. 1. This *name*, which declares the true character and dignity of Jesus Christ, is both the basis and the object of worship. See the somewhat parallel use of **εἰς τὸ ὄν.** in Inscrr. (Dsm., *BS.*, pp. 144-145). For the history of the phrase and its Semitic basis consult *Die biblische "im Namen,"* by J. Böhmer (Giessen, 1898).—**ἐπουρ. κ. ἐπιγ. κ. καταχθ.** Aptly Thdrt., **ἐπουρανίους καλεῖ τὰς ἀοράτους δυνάμεις, ἐπιγείους δὲ τοὺς ἔτι ζῶντας ἀνθρώπους καὶ καταχθονίους τοὺς τεθνεῶτας.**—**ἐπουρ.** The heavenly spirits. "Paul regards the higher world as divided into a series of ascending spheres" (Beysch., *N.T. Th.* [E.Tr.], ii., 100).—**καταχθ.** It is needless to think of these in connexion with the Descent into Hades, although this subject had an extraordinary place in the minds of the early Christians (*cf.* Bruston, *La Descente du Christ aux Enfers*, Paris, 1897). Here simply = a general term for the dead. Often in sepulchral Inscrr. For the division of all beings into three regions Everling compares Ignat. *ad Trall.*, 9, **ἀληθῶς ἐσταυρώθη καὶ ἀπέθανεν, βλεπόντων τῶν ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ ὑποχθονίων** (see his *Paulinische Angelologie u. Dämonologie*, Gött., 1888, pp. 83-84).

Ver. 11. **Κύριος.** See on ver. 6 *supr.* This is the characteristic confession of the Apostolic Church. It is most significant that **Κύριος** has no article, which shows that it has become virtually one of Christ's proper names. See Simcox, *Lang. of N.T.*, p. 49, and *cf.* Acts ii. 36, "Know assuredly that God made Him Lord as well as Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified" (so Hort); 1 Cor. xii. 3, Rom. x. 9, 1 Cor. viii. 6, where "One Lord" is parallel to "One God". Hort (on 1 Pet. i. 3) compares our verse with vv. 2-5. The invocation of one Lord is a bond of unity. The term "Lord" has become one of the most lifeless words in the Christian vocabulary. To enter into its meaning and give it practical effect would be to recreate, in great measure, the atmosphere of the Apostolic Age. [See, on the adoration of Jesus Christ in the Apostolic Age, an interesting essay by T. Zahn in *Skizzen aus d. Leben d. alten Kirche*, Leipz., 1894, pp. 1-38).—**εἰς δ. Θ.** The whole purpose of the working out of salvation is the glory of God the Father. This end is attained when men yield to His operations and acknowledge Christ as Lord. *Cf.* esp. Eph. i. 9-12.

Vv. 12-16. THE CHRISTIAN LIFE TO BE LED IN A SPIRIT OF AWE AND WATCHFULNESS, AS IN THE PRESENCE OF GOD'S WORKING. On vv. 12-13 see two important discussions, Schaeder, *Greifs-*

d See chap. i. 27.
e 1 Cor. ii. 3; 2 Cor. vii. 15; Eph. vi. 5; Exod. xv. 16; Isa. xix. 16.
f Rom. v. 3; 2 Cor. vii. 10; *cf.* Heb. xii. 1, 2.
g 1 Cor. xii. 6; Gal. iii. 5.

12. Ὥστε, ἀγαπητοί μου, καθὼς πάντοτε ὑπηκούσατε, μὴ ὡς [1] ἐν τῇ [d] παρουσίᾳ μου μόνον, ἀλλὰ νῦν πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἐν τῇ [d] ἀπουσίᾳ μου, μετὰ φόβου καὶ [e] τρόμου τὴν ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίαν [f] κατεργάζεσθε· 13. ὁ [2] Θεὸς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ [g] ἐνεργῶν ἐν ὑμῖν [3] καὶ τὸ θέλειν καὶ τὸ

[1] Om. B 3, 17, 38, 48, 72, cop. arm. æth., Chr., Ambrst. W.H. bracket. But, as Ws. shows (*TK.*, p. 122), ὡς was very liable to omission from carelessness. Prob. the -ως of καθώς might be the occasion.

[2] So Db et cEL, Chr., Thdrt. Edd. om. ὁ with ℵABCD*FGKP 17, Eus., Euth.cod.

[3] A adds δυναμεις.

walder Studien, pp. 231-260, and Kühl, *SK.*, 1898, pp. 557-580. Ver. 12. **ὥστε.** With what does it link the following verses? Paul has returned to practical exhortation. So we should naturally expect him to take up the thread which he dropped at ver. 6 on turning to the example of Jesus Christ. At that point he had been urging them to be of one mind. But with what aim? Especially in order that they might present an unbroken front in their conflict for the faith. But that brings us back to i. 27 ff. And that the connexion of our passage with the earlier paragraph is not arbitrary we may gather from the occurrence of the same idea in both, *viz.*, that of his own presence and absence. *Cf.* i. 27 *b* with ii. 12 *b*. At the same time there is also a link between vv. 12-13 and the passage immediately preceding. He introduces his admonition with obedience (**ὑπηκούσατε**). But Christ's lowliness consisted precisely in His **ὑπακοή** (ver. 8, **ὑπήκοος**). Christ has been exalted as the result (**διό**, ver. 9) of humble obedience. Corresponding to His exaltation will be their **σωτηρία.**—**ὑπηκούσατε.** We believe that this means obedience to God. See on **ὥστε** *supr.*—**κατεργάζ.** *Cf.* Gal. iv. 18.—**μετὰ φ. κ. τρ.** *Cf.* Eph. vi. 5, **οἱ δοῦλοι, ὑπακούετε τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου.** In both passages the phrase expresses the solemn responsibility to God which is always felt by those conscious of the Divine Presence, whether they are occupied with common tasks or the concerns of their spiritual life. *Nihil enim est quod magis ad modestiam et timorem erudire nos debeat quam dum audimus nos sola Dei gratia stare* (Calvin). Gunkel (*Wirkungen*[2], etc., p. 70) well contrasts the fear with which the Jew looked upon the Divine Presence with the calm joy which the Christian feels in such an experience.—**τὴν ἑαυτ. σωτ.** Such a use of **ἑαυτῶν** for **ὑμῶν αὐτῶν** is much more common in N.T. than in classical Greek. But *cf.* Demos., *Olynth.*, i., § 2, **εἴπερ σωτηρίας αὑτῶν φροντίζετε.** The emphasis is on **ἑαυτῶν.** Each of them is responsible for his own salvation before God. They must not lean on the Apostle. His absence must make no difference. "For the race is run by one and one and never by two and two" (R. Kipling). —**σωτ.** This is the end and aim of their faith. See 1 Pet. i. 9, **τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν.**—**κατεργ.** The best comment on the distinctive force of **κατεργ.** is 2 Cor. vii. 10, **ἡ γὰρ κατὰ Θεὸν λύπη μετάνοιαν εἰς σωτηρίαν . . . ἐργάζεται· ἡ δὲ τοῦ κόσμου λύπη θάνατον κατεργάζεται,** where **ἐργ.** refers to a process in its mediate workings, while **κατεργ.** looks solely at the final result. So here almost = "make sure of your salvation," "carry it into effect". *Cf.* 2 Pet. i. 10. As Kühl (*op. cit.*, p. 560 ff.) points out, the Apostle does not think here so much of the moral effort, their deliberate conduct as such (so Schaeder). This, as the presupposition of salvation, would be alien to the Pauline point of view. Lowliness and obedience (the **ὑπακοὴ πίστεως**) are needful, that they may look away from themselves to Jesus Christ, who is the "author and finisher of their faith".

Ver. 13. **ὁ** must certainly be omitted with all the best authorities. "For *God* is He that works," etc. The emphasis lies on **Θεός** for two reasons. First, in the matter of attaining salvation they have to do *not* with Paul, but with God. Second, they must enter upon this momentous course not lightly, but "with fear and trembling," for if they miss the goal it means that they have deliberately

ἐνεργεῖν ὑπὲρ τῆς [h]εὐδοκίας.[1] 14. πάντα ποιεῖτε χωρὶς [i]γογγυσμῶν [h] See on chap. i. 15 *supr.*
καὶ [k]διαλογισμῶν, 15. ἵνα γένησθε [l]ἄμεμπτοι καὶ [m]ἀκέραιοι, τέκνα [i] Acts vi. 1; 1 Pet. iv. 9; *cf.* Exod. xvi.
Θεοῦ [n]ἀμώμητα [2] ἐν [3] [o]μέσῳ [3] γενεᾶς [p]σκολιᾶς καὶ [q]διεστραμμένης,

7 al. [k] Rom. xiv. 1; 1 Tim. ii. 8. See note *infr.* [l] Chap. iii. 6; Luke i. 6; 1 Thess. iii. 13. Freq. in LXX., *e.g.*, Job i. 1. [m] Matt. x. 16; Rom. xvi. 19. [n] 2 Pet. iii. 14. For *v.l.* ἄμωμα, Eph. i. 4, v. 27; Col. i. 22. [o] See note *infr.* [p] Acts ii. 40; 1 Pet. ii. 18; Deut. xxxii. 5. Freq. in LXX., esp. Prov. [q] Matt. xvii. 17; Luke ix. 41; Acts xx. 30. Often in LXX.

[1] C, æth. add **αυτου**.

[2] So Myr. with DEFGKLP, Chr., Euth.cod., Thdrt. Edd. **αμωμα** with ℵABC 17, 23, Clem., Vict.graec.

[3] So Db et cEKL, Chr., Thdrt., Dam. Edd. **μεσον** with ℵABCD*FGP 17, 23, 31, 67**, Euth.cod.

rejected the purpose of God. This explains the connecting **γάρ**.—**ὁ ἐνεργῶν**. It seems always to have the idea of *effective* working. In N.T. the active is invariably used of God. The middle is always intransitive. The verb has become transitive only in later Greek (*cf.* Krebs, *Rection d. Casus*, ii., 21). Many exx. occur in Justin M.—**τὸ θέλειν**. The first resolution in the direction of salvation takes its origin from God. So also does the **ἐνεργεῖν**, the carrying of this inward resolve into practical effect, the acting on the assurance that God's promise is genuine. *Cf.* Eph. ii. 8, **τῇ γὰρ χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι, διὰ πίστεως· καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν, Θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον**. To Paul the Divine working and the human self-determination are compatible. But "all efforts to divide the ground between God and man go astray" (Rainy, *op. cit.*, p. 136).—**ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐδοκίας**. "To carry out His own gracious will." So Thdrt. (see also Gennrich, *SK.*, 1898, p. 383, *n.* 1). His great purpose of mercy is the salvation of men. To realise this He surrounds them with the influences of His gracious Spirit. For the word *cf.* Ps. Sol. viii. 39, **ἡμῖν καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ἡμῶν ἡ εὐδοκία εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα**. Conyb.-Hows. and Hfm. would join **ὑπὲρ τ. εὐδ.** with the words following, but this would be unintelligible without **αὐτοῦ**. Blass boldly reads **ὑπὲρ (οὗ) τ. εὐδοκίας πάντα ποι.** (*N.T. Gramm.*, p. 132). Such procedure is arbitrary. Zahn and Wohl. (with Pesh. and O.L. versions) connect the words with **τὸ ἐνεργ.** preceding, and, comparing Rom. vii. 15-21, make **εὐδ.** = human inclination to goodness, *i.e.*, practically equiv. to **θέλειν**. But this is the interpretation of a subtle exegete, which would scarcely appeal to a plain reader. The interpretation given above, connecting **ὑπ. τ. εὐδ.** with **ὁ ἐνεργ.**, is thoroughly natural and has many parallels in Paul, *e.g.*, Eph. i. 5, 9, etc. See esp. SH. on Rom. x. 1. These verses are a rebuke to all egotism and empty boasting (see ii. 3).

Ver. 14. **γογγ.** Many Comm. understand **γογγ.** and **διαλογ.** as referring to God. This interpretation appears far-fetched and unnecessary. The whole discussion preceding has turned on the danger to their faith in being disunited. Is it not natural that when he speaks of "grumblings" and "discussions" he should point to their mutual disagreements? Would not these be the common expressions, *e.g.*, of the variance between Euodia and Syntyche? May they not be connected with the **ἑτέρως τι φρονεῖν** of chap. iii. 15? There has never been a hint of murmuring against God up till now. *Cf.* 1 Peter iv. 9, Wisd. i. 11, **φυλάξασθε . . . γογγυσμὸν ἀνωφελῆ καὶ ἀπὸ καταλαλιᾶς φείσασθε γλώσσης**. On **γογγ.** see esp. H. Anz, *Dissertationes Halenses*, vol. xii., pars 2, pp. 368-369.—**διαλογ.** Probably = disputes. Common in this sense in later Greek. *Cf.* Luke ix. 46. Originally = thoughts, with the idea of doubt or hesitation gradually implied. See Hatch, *Essays in Bibl. Greek*, p. 8.

Ver. 15. **γένησθε**. "That ye may become." A high ideal before Paul's mind to be reached by a gradual process.—**ἄμεμπτοι. οὐ μικρὰν γὰρ προσάγει κηλῖδα ὁ γογγυσμός** (Chr.). Perhaps **ἄμεμ.** refers to the judgment of others, while **ἀκέραιοι** denotes their intrinsic character (so Lft.). *Cf.* Matt. x. 16, where Christ exhorts the disciples to be **ἀκέραιοι ὡς αἱ περιστεραί.**—**τέκνα Θεοῦ**. This whole clause is a reminiscence, not a quotation, of Deut. xxxii. 5, **ἡμάρτοσαν, οὐκ αὐτῷ τέκνα, μωμητά· γενεὰ σκολιὰ καὶ διεστραμμένη**. It is impossible to say whether Paul uses **τ. Θ.**

ἐν οἷς φαίνεσθε ὡς [r] φωστῆρες ἐν κόσμῳ, 16. [s] λόγον ζωῆς [t] ἐπέχοντες,[1] εἰς [u] καύχημα ἐμοὶ εἰς ἡμέραν Χριστοῦ, ὅτι οὐκ εἰς [v] κενὸν ἔδραμον, οὐδὲ εἰς κενὸν [w] ἐκοπίασα. 17. [3]Ἀλλ[3] εἰ καὶ[2] [x] σπένδομαι ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ [y] λειτουργίᾳ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν, χαίρω καὶ [z] συγχαίρω[3]

r Rev. xxi. 11; Gen. i. 14, 16; Wisd. xiii. 2.
s For the thought, *cf.* John vi. 68; Acts v. 20. Phrase only here. *Cf.* 1 Cor. i. 18; 2 Cor. v. 19 *al.*
t No parallel in N.T. or LXX. See note *infr.*
u See on chap. i. 26.
v Gal. ii. 2; *cf.* Rom. ix. 16; Gal. v. 7.
w *Cf.* Isa. xlix. 4.
x 2 Tim. iv. 6.
y Ritual sense in Luke i. 23; Heb. viii. 6, ix. 21. More general use in 2 Cor. ix. 12, and prob. ver. 30 of this chap. Often in LXX.
z Luke i. 58, xv. 6, 9; 1 Cor. xii. 26 = rejoice with.

[1] ℵ* εχοντες. [2] και ει FG, f, g, vg.

[3] So Trg., Alf. with ABcDcEKsil.L. Ti., W.H., Ws. συνχαιρω with ℵaB*CD*FGP. ℵ* om. και συνχαιρω.

in the strict sense common in N.T., or whether he employs the term more loosely as in Eph. v. 8.—The best authorities read **ἄμωμα**, the more usual N.T. word. **ἀμωμητά** may be due to **μωμητά** of LXX. —**μέσον** is certainly to be read instead of **ἐν μέσῳ**, with all leading authorities. It is one of those adverbial expressions which, in the later language, perhaps under the influence of Semitic usage, took the place of prepositions. *Cf.* Hatz., *Einl.*, p. 214, where several exx. are quoted from Porphyrogenitus, *de Caer.*—**σκολ. κ. διεστραμ.** The latter epithet is precisely = the Scotch expression "thrawn," "having a twist" in the inner nature.—**ἐν οἷς.** Sense-construction.—**φαίν.** Comm. differ as to whether **φ.** means here "appear" or "shine". Surely the appearing of a **φωστήρ**, a luminary, must be, at the same time, a shining. Both interpretations really converge in this context. [Calv. takes **φαίν.** as imperative, and compares Isa. lx. 2. This is by no means unlikely.] Probably **κόσμος** (= the whole universe of things) goes closely with **φωστῆρες**, emphasising the contrast, while nothing is said as to their influence on others. Christ Himself is **τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου** (John viii. 12). His followers are **φωστῆρες ἐν κόσμῳ.** For **κόσμος** see Evans' excellent note on 1 Cor. ii. 12.

Ver. 16. **λ. ζωῆς.** For the connexion between this expression and **φωστῆρες** see John i. 4, **ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων.** When Paul speaks of "life" as belonging to the Christian he means not merely the new power of holy living imparted to him, but the real presence of a truly Divine life which, although largely concealed for the present by the fleshly nature, is the pledge and actual beginning of life eternal. This is, in the Apostle's view, the supreme goal of the Christian calling. The Christian gospel, therefore, is a **λόγος ζωῆς.**—**ἐπέχοντες.** Its common meaning (as in Homer, etc.) is "holding forth". But the Apostle is not thinking of the influence exercised by his readers upon others. It is their own steadfastness in the faith that is before his mind in this passage. That tells against the interpretation of Field (*Otium Norvicense*, iii., pp. 118-119, following Pesh. with Michaelis, Wetstein, etc.), who translates, "being in the stead of life" (to it, *sc.*, the world), "holding the analogy of life". No doubt there are good exx. of the phrase in later Greek, but we are safe in saying that the ordinary N.T. reader would not understand **λόγ. ζ.** in this sense. Chr. and Thphl. take it as = "having in them" (a strengthened **ἔχειν**). Th. Mps. has "holding fast," which is also the gloss of Hesychius on the word (**κρατοῦντες**). There is practically no difference between the two last explanations. Either suits the context well. It was quite customary in late Greek to use intensified forms like **ἐπέχειν** as stronger equivalents for the simpler words.—**εἰς καύχ.** "For a ground of boasting." *Cf.* Zeph. iii. 20, **δώσω ὑμᾶς ὀνομαστοὺς καὶ εἰς καύχημα.** —**ἡμέρα Χ.** A combination only found in this Epistle. As the Apostle advanced in years the final result of his labours would have increasing prominence in his thoughts.—**ὅτι.** Does this introduce the ground of his boasting, or is it used in an "anticipative" sense = because? The latter seems necessary, as the reason of his boasting has already been given, their blamelessness and steadfastness.—**ἔδραμον . . . ἐκοπίασα.** These aorists look back from the day of Christ over the whole course of Paul's life and work. It is now finished, and it has not failed. We must translate by English perfects, "I have not run," etc. Lft. thinks that **ἐκοπ.** is a metaphor from "training" in athletic contests. See his important note

πᾶσιν ὑμῖν· 18. τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ ὑμεῖς χαίρετε καὶ συγχαίρετέ μοι.

19. Ἐλπίζω δὲ ἐν Κυρίῳ[1] Ἰησοῦ, Τιμόθεον ταχέως πέμψαι ὑμῖν,[2] ἵνα

[1] Lach. Χριστω with CD*FG 38, 71, 74, d, e, g, cop.
[2] D*, O.L. vg., προς υμας.

on Ignat. *ad Polyc.*, vi., **συγκοπιᾶτε ἀλλήλοις, συναθλεῖτε, συντρέχετε.** But its occurrence in Isa. xlix. 4 (**κενῶς ἐκοπίασα, εἰς μάταιον καὶ εἰς οὐδὲν ἔδωκα τὴν ἰσχύν μου**) shows that it may be taken without any metaphorical significance.

Vv. 17-18. MUTUAL REJOICING IN CHRISTIAN SERVICE.—Ver. 17. "Nay, although I should even be offered (lit. 'poured out as a libation') upon the sacrifice and sacred service," etc. **εἰ καί** leaves abundant room for the possibility, as distinct from **καὶ εἰ,** which barely allows the supposition. See esp. Hermann on *Viger*, no. 307. The metaphor of this verse has given rise to much discussion. It is admitted that **σπένδ.** = to be poured out as a drink offering. *Cf.* 2 Tim. iv. 6, **ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤδη σπένδομαι.** But what is the meaning of **ἐπί**? Is it "upon," "over," or "in addition to," "concurrently with"? Ell. and others, holding that the Apostle refers to *Jewish* sacrificial usages in which, it is said, the drink-offering was poured, not over the sacrifice but round the altar, decide for the latter sense. Paul's life would be a sacrifice additional to that of their faith. But, in writing to the Philippians, it is far more likely that he should illustrate from heathen ritual in which the libation took so prominent a place. In that case we have an apt parallel in Hom., *Il.*, xi., 775, **σπένδων αἴθοπα οἶνον ἐπ' αἰθομένοις ἱεροῖσι,** where **ἐπί** can scarcely mean anything but "upon". After all, the decision between the two does not affect the sense. The offering of Paul in either case, instead of being a cause of sadness and despair, is really the climax of their sacrifice, the libation which crowns it. Zahn (*op. cit.*, p. 296-297), followed by Hpt., joins **ἐπί** with **χαίρω** in the sense of "I rejoice on account of the sacrifice," etc. This is certainly attractive, but seems too bold in view of the order of the words. —**τῇ θυσίᾳ κ. λειτ. τ. πίστ.** Here, again, unnecessary difficulties have been raised over the question whether Paul or the Philippians are to be regarded as offering the sacrifice. There is no evidence that the Apostle wishes to strain the metaphor to the breaking point. He has been urging them to preserve their Christian faith pure and unfaltering. That will be a joy to him in the dav of Christ. But now another thought crosses his mind. What if in his Christian labours he should fall a victim? The idea gives a sacrificial cast to his thinking, and he regards their faith (*i.e.*, virtually, their Christian profession and life), on the one hand, as a **θυσία,** an offering presented to God (*cf.* Rom. xii. 1), and, on the other, as a **λειτουργία,** a sacred service, the presenting of that offering. (For the ritual use of **λειτ.** in Egyptian Papyri see Dsm., *BS.*, pp. 137-138). "Even although I should fall a victim to my labours in the cause of Christ, I rejoice because your faith is an accomplished fact. I rejoice on my own account (**χαίρω**) because I have been the instrument of your salvation. I also share in the joy (**συγχαίρω**) which you experience in the new life you have received." This paraphrase, perhaps, expresses the real force of the words in their close connexion with the context. We can see no ground for translating **συγχαίρω** (with Lft. and others) as "congratulate," a translation which surely misses the point of the language. *Cf.* 1 Cor. xii. 26.

Ver. 18. **τὸ δ' αὐτό.** Adverbial use = **ὡσαύτως.** *Cf.* Matt. xxvii. 44.—**συγχαίρ.** This is, of course, a different joy from that which he shares with them. It is their joy in his obtaining the martyr's crown.

Vv. 19-24. HIS PURPOSE TO SEND TO THEM TIMOTHY, A GENUINE FRIEND OF THEIR COMMUNITY.—Ver. 19. Clemen (*Einheitlichkeit d. paulin. Briefe*, p. 138) seeks to prove that vv. 19-24 do not belong to this context. This is to forget the flexibility and rapid transitions natural to a friendly letter. The last paragraph, in spite of its joyful tone, ended with a note of anxious foreboding for the Philippians. He will dispel the dark shadow.—**ἐν Κ. Ἰησ.** *Cf.* ver. 24 *infr.*, and the repeated occurrence of this and cognate phrases all through Paul's Epistles. See the note on chap. i. 1 *supr.* His intention depends on the will and power of Christ, just as its

a Only here in N.T. κἀγὼ [a]εὐψυχῶ, γνοὺς τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν. 20. οὐδένα γὰρ ἔχω [b]ἰσόψυχον,
b Only here in N.T.; ὅστις [c]γνησίως τὰ περὶ[1] ὑμῶν [d]μεριμνήσει. 21. οἱ πάντες γὰρ τὰ
Ps. liv. 14. ἑαυτῶν [e]ζητοῦσιν, οὐ τὰ τοῦ[2] Χριστοῦ[3] Ἰησοῦ. 22. τὴν δὲ [f]δοκιμὴν
c Only here in N.T. αὐτοῦ γινώσκετε, ὅτι ὡς πατρὶ τέκνον, σὺν ἐμοὶ ἐδούλευσεν εἰς τὸ
d 1 Cor. vii. 34, xii. 25; Exod. v. 9; Bar. iii. 18. e 1 Cor. x. 24, xiii. 5. f In N.T. only in Paul, *e.g.*, Rom. v. 4; 2 Cor. ii. 9. Rare word. Ps. lxvii. 31 (Symm.).

[1] L ὑπερ.

[2] So some minn., Chr., Thdrt. Edd. om. του with ℵABCDEFGKLP, Clem.

[3] So Ti., Ws., W.H. (ʳ ˡ) with BL, cop. syrp. æthro., Thdrt., Thphl., Chr.[303] txt. Trg., Alf., Lft., Myr., W.H. (mg.) I. X. with ℵACDEFGP 17, 39, 47, 115, O.L. vgcle. am. tol. syr.sch. arm., Clem., Chr.[304] com., Euth.cod., Victorin., Ambrst. Χριστου K, æthpp., Cyp.[307].

performance will be regulated with a view to His glory—**πέμψαι.** We should expect future infinitive, but the aorist is often used instead "after verbs of hoping and promising in which *wish* or *will* intrudes" (Gildersleeve on Justin M., *Apol.*, i., 12, 23).—**κἀγώ.** He takes for granted that the visit of Timothy will cheer the Philippians. It will cheer him also to know how they do.—**εὐψυχῶ.** Common in sepulchral Inscrr. in the form **εὐψύχει,** "farewell!" There are a few exx. elsewhere, *e.g.*, Joseph., *Ant.*, xi., 6, 9, of Ahasuerus, **καὶ τὴν Ἐσθῆρ' εὐψυχεῖν καὶ τὰ κρείττω προσδοκᾷν παρεθάρρυνεν.**—**γνούς** has probably a slightly ingressive force, "when I come to know".

Ver. 20. **ἰσόψυχον.** "Compounds with **ἰσο-** usually mean not merely 'like,' but 'as good as,' or 'no better than'" (Jebb on Soph., *O.T.*, 478). To whom does it refer? De W., Myr., Vinc. and others refer it to Paul. But surely it can only apply to Timothy. At least the relative sentence seems to necessitate this interpretation. "I have no one like-minded, I mean having that kind of mind (**ὅστις**) which will, etc. . . . but ye know his approvedness." Besides, if he were thinking of himself, must he not have added **ἄλλον** to **οὐδένα**?—**γνησίως,** "genuinely". There is no apparent necessity to take it (with Lft. and Vinc.) as = "by an instinct derived from his spiritual parentage". **γν.** is used frequently in secular writers = true, genuine. *Cf.* Phocyl., 2, **γνήσιος φίλος**; Pind., *Olymp.*, ii., 21, **γνησίαις ἐπ' ἀρεταῖς.** *Cf.* chap. iv. 3.—**μεριμνήσει** = "give one's thoughts to a matter". *Cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 33, and see a good note in Jebb on Soph., *O.T.*, 1124.

Ver. 21. **οἱ πάντες . . . ζητ.** This verse has roused surprise. Where were all Paul's faithful brethren in the Lord? Has he no one but Timothy to fall back upon? It must be borne in mind that we have to do with a simple letter, not a treatise, or history of Paul's work. The Apostle speaks in an outburst of strong feeling, for he is a man of quick impulses. He does not for a moment mean that he has no genuine Christian brethren in his company. But he had found, in all probability, that when he proposed to some of his companions, good Christian men, that they should visit far-distant Philippi, they all shrank, making various excuses. Timothy alone is willing, the one man he can least afford to spare. It is hard to part with him at such a critical time. No wonder that he should feel hurt by this want of inclination on the part of the other brethren to undertake an important Christian duty. No wonder that he should speak with severity of a disposition so completely opposed to his own. *Cf.* 1 Cor. x. 33, **μὴ ζητῶν τὸ ἐμαυτοῦ σύμφορον ἀλλὰ τὸ τῶν πολλῶν.** See esp. Calvin's excellent note *ad loc.*—**X. Ἰ.** The authorities are almost equally balanced as to the readings. See on chap. i. 1 *supr.*

Ver. 22. **δοκιμήν.** "Approvedness." That character which emerges as the result of testing. *Cf.* Jas. i. 12.—**ὡς πατ. τέκ. κ.τ.λ.** A mixed construction, the result of refined feeling. Paul first thinks of Timothy as his son in the Gospel, serving him with a son's devotion. But before the sentence is finished, his lowliness reminds him that they are both alike servants of a common Lord, equal in His sight.—**εἰς** seems here practically equiv. to **ἐν,** as so frequently in later Greek. The fact is one of real importance for exegesis. (See Hatz., *Einl.*, p. 210;

εὐαγγέλιον. 23. τοῦτον μὲν οὖν ἐλπίζω πέμψαι, [g] ὡς ἂν ἀπίδω [1] τὰ περὶ ἐμέ, [h] ἐξαυτῆς· 24. πέποιθα δὲ ἐν Κυρίῳ, ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸς ταχέως ἐλεύσομαι.[2] 25. ἀναγκαῖον δὲ ἡγησάμην Ἐπαφρόδιτον τὸν ἀδελφὸν [i] καὶ [i] συνεργὸν [3] καὶ [k] συστρατιώτην [4] μου, ὑμῶν δὲ [l] ἀπόστολον, καὶ

[g] See note *infr.*
[h] See note *infr.*
[i] Of twelve exx. in N.T. only one outside Paul's writings. See esp. Rom. xvi. 3, 9, 21; Philm. 24; 2 Macc. viii. 7.
[k] Philm. 2.
[l] John xiii. 16; 2 Cor. viii. 23; 1 Kings xiv. 6 (A.).

[1] So Ws. with B^3C (απειδω) $D^cEK^{sil}LP$, Chr., Thdrt. Ti., Trg., W.H., Alf. αφιδω with ℵAB*D*FG 17, Euth.cod. Ws. admits that αφ. is better attested, but considers it, nevertheless, to be an ancient copyist's blunder, due to the analogy of ἀφορᾶν. He compares επισταται (εφ.) in 1 Thess. v. 3. See also Acts iv. 29, *v.l.*, εφιδε. (*TK.*, p. 141. See also W-Sch., p. 39, *a*).

[2] So edd. with ℵ^{c}BDEFGKL, d, e, g, syr$^{p.}$ arm. æth. go., Euth.cod., Thdrt., Dam., Victorin. προς υμας added by ℵ*ACP 23, 39, 57, 115, f, vg. cop. syr$^{sch.}$, Chr.^{306}, Thphl., Ambrst. Ws. (*TK.*, p. 109) gives exx. of prepositional additions of this kind appearing in ancient as well as later MSS.

[3] Om. D*, d, e, Victorin., Ambrst.

[4] So ℵBKLP. Edd. συνστρατ. with ACDEFG. This is one of the orthographical points on which Bousset (*Textkrit. Studien*, pp. 102, 103) bases a grouping of N.T. MSS., assigning ℵB to the Hesychian recension. See his very important discussion.

Schmid, *Atticismus*, i., p. 91; Krumbacher, *Kuhn's Zeitschr.*, 27, pp. 543-544). One can hardly discover here the idea of purpose.

Ver. 23. **μέν.** He emphasises the coming of Timothy as distinct from his own. —**ὡς ἄν.** *Cf.* Rom. xv. 24, 1 Cor. xi. 34. "As soon as I shall have thoroughly ascertained my position." This temporal use of **ὡς ἄν** seems foreign to classical prose. It almost means "according as I shall". **ἄν** marks the uncertainty which surrounds the whole prospect. (See W-M., p. 387; Viteau, *Le Verbe*, p. 126.) —**ἀπίδω.** On the form see the crit. note *supr.* **ἀπό** emphasises his turning away his attention from other things and concentrating it upon his own situation, *i.e.*, gaining a definite knowledge of how his affairs stand. Mynster (*Kleine Theolog. Schriften*, p. 173) points out that this verse proves that the Epistle could not have been written at Cæsarea.—**ἐξαυτῆς.** Chiefly in Acts in N.T. = Latin *ilico*. A Hellenistic word. See Phrynichus (ed. Lobeck), 47.

Ver. 24. **ἐν Κυρίῳ.** See on ver. 19. Every mood of Paul's inner life he desires to regulate by the mind and will of Christ.—**ὅτι.** "When an *action* is to be produced, **πείθειν** takes the infinitive, when *belief*, **ὅτι** (of objective knowledge) sometimes infinitive" (Gildersl. on Justin M., *Apol.*, i., 8, 8).

Vv. 25-30. NEWS OF EPAPHRODITUS: A CORDIAL WELCOME FOR HIM AT PHILIPPI BESPOKEN.—Ver. 25. This verse opens a passage which Clemen (*op. cit.*, pp. 138-141) assigns to the second of the two letters into which he proposes to divide the Epistle. See our *Introduction*. The Apostle, as a matter of fact, passes most naturally from the two visits which he half promises to the return of Epaphroditus, which is an immediate certainty.—**ἡγησ.** Epistolary aorist. He writes from the point of view of those who receive the letter.—**Ἐπαφ.** Only mentioned in this Epistle, unless we are to suppose him to be the same person as **Ἐπαφρᾶς** of Col. i. 7, Philm. 23. Such contractions of names were quite common, *e.g.*, **Ζηνᾶς** = **Ζηνόδωρος, Μενέστας** = **Μενέστρατος** (see W-Sch., pp. 142-143). But this hypothesis ill accords with the description in Col. iv. 12, **Ἐπ. ὁ ἐξ ὑμῶν,** to say nothing of the fact that, on our view of the dating of the Imprisonment-Epistles, Epaphras would by this time have left Rome.—**ἀδ. κ. συνεργ. κ. συστρ.** Aptly Anselm: *Frater in fide, cooperator in praedicatione, commilito in adversis*. There is no need to suppose (with Gw.) that **συνεργ.** implies that Epaphroditus was in the ministry, or (with Ws.) that **συστρ.** points to Paul's conflict at Philippi. Both terms suit his circumstances at Rome.—**ὑμῶν δὲ ἀπ. κ. λειτ. τ. χρ. μ. ἀπόστολος** is always used of some one entrusted with a mission; it is a word of dignified tone. Moule (*PS.*, p. 133) thinks we have here "a gentle pleas-

m Rom. xiii. 6, xv. 16; Heb. viii. 2. Freq. in LXX.
n Periphrasis very common in Mark, Luke and Acts.
o Only Matt. xxvi. 37; Mark xiv. 33.
p Only here in N.T. See W-M., p. 590.
q See note *infr.*
r *Cf.* (although differing) Luke vii. 4; 2 Tim. i. 17; Tit. iii. 13.

m λειτουργὸν τῆς χρείας μου, πέμψαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς· 26. ἐπειδὴ ἐπιποθῶν n ἦν πάντας ὑμᾶς,[1] καὶ o ἀδημονῶν, διότι ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἠσθένησε[2]· 27. καὶ γὰρ ἠσθένησε p παραπλήσιον θανάτῳ[3]· ἀλλ' ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν ἠλέησεν,[4] οὐκ αὐτὸν δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐμέ, ἵνα μὴ λύπην q ἐπὶ λύπῃ[5] σχῶ.[6] 28. r σπουδαιοτέρως[7] οὖν ἔπεμψα αὐτόν, ἵνα, ἰδόντες

[1] So ℵ[c]BFGKLP, f, g, vg. go., Chr., Thdrt., Victorin. Lach. (brackets), W.H. (brackets), Myr. add ιδειν with ℵ*ACDE, d, e, syrr. cop. arm. æth. Euth.[cod.], Dam., Thphl., Cassiod. Myr. would account for its omission by assimilation to chap. i. 8. But its insertion is equally well accounted for by the same phrase in Rom. i. 11, 1 Thess. iii. 6, 2 Tim. i. 4.

[2] D*E*FG, O.L. vg. **αυτον ησθενηκεναι.**

[3] So Ti., Trg., Alf., Ws. with ℵ*ACDEFGKL. W.H. **θανατου** with ℵ[c]BP 29, 31, 44, 80, 115, Chr., Euth.[cod.]

[4] So KL, Chr., Thdrt., Dam. **ηλ. αυτον** edd. with ℵABC**DEFGP 17, 37, 116, O.L. vg. syrr. arm., Euth.[cod.], Victorin., Ambrst.

[5] So Chr.[montf.], Thdrt. Edd. **λυπην** with all MSS.

[6] D*EFG 1, 23, 44 **εχω.** [7] **σπουδαιοτερον** D*FG.

antry," their gift being a sort of Gospel to him. But its ordinary Greek use as = "delegate" makes this unnecessary. —**λειτουργόν.** "Minister." Evidently the technical, ritual use of this word and its cognates which prevailed in the post-classical age and is found in LXX (of priests and esp. Levites) and Egyptian Papyri (see H. Anz, *Dissertationes Philol. Halenses*, xii., 2, pp. 346-347; Dsm., *BS.*, p. 137 ff.) suggests the idea of their gift as being a sacrifice, an oblation to God. In chap. iv. 18 he calls it expressly a **θυσία.** See an interesting discussion of Paul's use of pagan terms in *Expository Times*, x., Nos. 1-5, by Prof. W. M. Ramsay.

Ver. 26. **ἐπειδή.** Only three times elsewhere in Paul. The difference between it and **ἐπεί** is tersely stated by Ell. (*ad loc.*), who notes that it "involves the quasi-temporal reference which is supplied by **δή,** and thus expresses a thing that at once ensues (temporarily or causally) on the occurrence or realisation of another".—**ἐπιπ. ἦν.** A common N.T. construction. Perhaps the use of the imperfect may be due to Aramaic influence (see Schmid, *Atticismus*, iii., p. 113 ff.). In classical Greek it is fairly frequent with the perfect and pluperfect. See Kühner, *Ausführl. Gramm.*, ii., p. 35, *n.* 3.—**πάντας.** The Apostle wishes to disarm all prejudices against Epaphr.—**ἀδημονῶν.** "In sore anguish." In its two other occurrences in N.T. it describes the agony in Gethsemane. While not found in LXX (but several exx. in Symmachus) it occurs a few times in later Greek. The derivations usually given are doubtful.—**ἠκούσατε.** Probably we must suppose that the Philippians, on hearing that Epaphrod. was ill, had written a letter to which *this* is the answer.—**ἠσθένησε.** We might translate, "had fallen sick," an ingressive aorist. But with the same tense in ver. 27, perhaps it is better to look upon the aorist as summing up the whole experience of Epaphrod. as a single fact, and viewing it in this light. This is a common Greek usage (see Burton, *MT.*, p. 20).

Ver. 27. **καὶ γὰρ κ.τ.λ.** "For truly he *was* sick," etc., **καί** intensifying the force of **ἠσθέν.**—**θαν.** The more common construction of **παραπλ.,** backed by a preponderating weight of authority, favours the dative. The endings **-ου** and **-ω** were frequently interchanged in the MSS. (see Ws. *TK.*, p. 18).—**λύπην ἐπὶ λύπην.** The reading **λύπῃ** is merely a simplifying of the construction. The accusative must be read. The usage is practically = **ἐπί** with dative. It denotes the heaping up of one thing upon another with the notion of addition predominant. *Cf.* Matt. xxiv. 2, **οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον**; Isa. xxviii. 10, **θλίψιν ἐπὶ θλίψιν προσδέχου**; Ps. Sol. iii. 7, **οὐκ αὐλίζεται ἐν οἴκῳ δικαίου ἁμαρτία ἐφ' ἁμαρτίαν.** See Buttm., *Gram.*, p. 338.—**σχῶ.** Equiv. to our "get". This is the force of the aorist.

αὐτὸν πάλιν, χαρῆτε, κἀγὼ [s] ἀλυπότερος ὦ. 29. [t] προσδέχεσθε οὖν αὐτὸν ἐν Κυρίῳ μετὰ πάσης χαρᾶς, καὶ τοὺς τοιούτους [u] ἐντίμους ἔχετε· 30. ὅτι διὰ τὸ ἔργον τοῦ Χριστοῦ [1] [v] μέχρι θανάτου ἤγγισε, [w] παραβουλευσάμενος [2] τῇ ψυχῇ, ἵνα [x] ἀναπληρώσῃ [3] τὸ ὑμῶν [y] ὑστέρημα τῆς πρός με λειτουργίας.

s Only here in N.T. Common in Greek writers.
t Rom. xvi. 2; 1 Chron. xii. 18.
u Luke vii. 2, xiv. 8; Isa. xxviii. 16.
v See chap. ii. 8 *supr.*
w Only here in N.T. See note *infr.*
x 1 Cor. xvi. 17. *Cf.* Plat., *Symp.*, 188 E (quoted by Grimm), εἴ τι ἐξέλιπον, σὸν ἔργον, ὦ Ἀριστόφανες, ἀναπληρῶσαι.
y In this sense only in Paul, *e.g.*, Col. i. 24. A few exx. in LXX.

[1] So DEKL, Chr., Thdrt., Dam. Lach., Ti., Trg., Ws. **Χριστου** alone with BFG 73, 80 (W.H. mg.). W.H. (𝔓) **Κυριου** with ℵAP 17, 31, 47, cop. syrp. arm. æth., Euth.cod. (Trg. mg.). Alf., Myr., Lft., Hpt. **το εργον** alone with C. Ws. (*TK.*, p. 7), arguing in favour of **Χριστου**, holds that, through misunderstanding, it was either omitted or (on the analogy of 1 Cor. xv. 58, xvi. 10) altered into **Κυριου**.

[2] So CKLP, Chr., Euth.cod., Thdrt., Dam. Edd. **παραβολευσαμενος** with ℵABDEFG 177, 178, 179, d, e, g (*parabolatus de anima sua*).

[3] **αναπληρωσει** ℵ 17, 114, 116, d.scr. **πληρωση** B 36, 43, 44, 109 *al.*

Ver. 28. **σπουδ.** The more regular form is the inferior reading **σπουδαιότερον**, which is due to some copyist. But that in **-ως** is also found in classical Greek. See W-Sch., p. 98. It is quite possible that we have here, as frequently in later popular Greek, a comparative with superlative force (see Blass, *Gramm.*, p. 33). "I sent him with all haste" (including the notion of anxiety and concern which belongs to **σπουδαῖος**).—**ἔπεμ.** Epistolary aorist.—**ἀλυπότ.** Their joy means the lifting of a burden from his heart. He sympathised with Epaphroditus' yearning for home. He sympathised with the Philippians' anxiety for their brother. Chr. aptly quotes Paul's own words in 2 Cor. xi. 29, **τίς ἀσθενεῖ καὶ οὐκ ἀσθενῶ; τίς σκανδαλίζεται καὶ οὐκ ἐγὼ πυροῦμαι.**

Ver. 29. Behind these words must lie some unknown circumstances which affected the feelings of the Philippians towards Epaphrod. It is not sufficient to suppose (with Ws.) that they would be disappointed because he had not stayed long enough at Rome. The **πάσης χαρᾶς** and **ἐντίμους** surely point to some alienation on which we have no light.

Ver. 30. **τὸ ἔργον κ.τ.λ.** The true reading is very difficult to determine with such a conflict of authorities. We are inclined to believe that **τὸ ἔργ.** stood alone as in C. This is certainly the hardest reading of all to account for. At a very early date additions like **Χριστοῦ, Κυρίου,** etc., would be sure to be made.—**μέχρι.** A somewhat rare use of **μ.** *Cf.* Rev. xii. 11, **οὐκ ἠγάπησαν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῶν ἄχρι θανάτου,** and chap. ii. 8.—**παραβολευσ.** Here, with the great majority of the best authorities, we must read **παραβολευσάμενος.** It is a **ἅπ. λεγ.,** probably formed from **παράβολος,** rash, reckless. *Cf.* the legal term **παράβολον** (later, **παραβόλιον**), the stake which has to be deposited by an appellant, and is forfeited if the action be lost. "Having hazarded his life." *Cf.* the exact parallel in Diod., 3, 36, 4, **παραβαλέσθαι ταῖς ψυχαῖς.** What risk did he run? Hfm. suggests that his illness was produced by his arrival in Rome during the hot season of the year. Chr. thinks of danger at the hands of Nero. Wohl. supposes that his illness was the result of his severe missionary labours in Rome. May it be that the Apostle was now confined in a far more unwholesome bondage than before (one of the noisome State-prisons? See *Introduction*), and that the assiduous services of Epaphrod. to him there, brought on this severe illness? We believe that this interpretation is justified by the next words **τὸ ὑμ. ὑστέρ. . . . λειτ.** In what was their service towards the Apostle lacking? Evidently in nothing save their own personal presence and personal care of him. This would be the more urgently needed if Paul's outward surroundings had become less favourable. For the phrase **ἀναπλ. τὸ ὑστ.,** *cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 17, **τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστέρημα οὗτοι ἀνεπλήρωσαν;** 2 Cor. xi. 9.

CHAPTER III.—Vv. 1-3. A SALUTATION CHANGED INTO A WARNING.—Ver. 1. **τὸ λοιπόν.** Probably A.V. rightly trans-

III. 1. ΤΟ λοιπόν, ἀδελφοί μου, χαίρετε ἐν Κυρίῳ. τὰ αὐτὰ [1] γράφειν ὑμῖν, ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐκ [a] ὀκνηρόν, ὑμῖν δὲ [b] ἀσφαλές.[2] 2. [c] βλέπετε τοὺς [d] κύνας, βλέπετε τοὺς κακοὺς [e] ἐργάτας, βλέπετε τὴν

a Rom. xii. 11 (but no exact parallel. So, many exx. in Provv.).
b No relevant parallel.
c Partly parallel are 1 Cor. i. 26, x. 18; 2 Cor. x. 7. Also Mark xiii. 23.
d Matt. vii. 6; Rev. xxii. 15.
e See note *infr.*, and *cf.* Matt. ix. 37; Luke xiii. 27; 2 Tim. ii. 15.

[1] ταυτα ℵ*FGP (cop. *ista*).

[2] το ασφαλες A* vid. 23, 31, 37, 73, 238, Procop.

lates "finally" (summing up all his exhortations to them). It must, however, be remembered that in late Greek **λοιπόν** had come to mean scarcely more than **οὖν**. Even in Plato, *Gorg.*, 458 D, there is something very closely approaching this usage. *Cf.* Matt. xxvi. 45 (and on it Aars in *Zw. Th.*, xxxviii., 3, pp. 378-383), Acts xxvii. 20 (where Blass translates by *jam*), 2 Tim. iv. 8. For instances in Epictetus see *Class. Review*, iii., p. 71. It is used regularly in this sense in Modern Greek. (*Cf.* also Schmid, *Atticismus*, iii., p. 135.)—**χαίρετε.** This is the impression he wishes to leave upon them. *Cf.* chap. ii. 18, iv. 4.—**τὰ αὐτά.** Alf., Ws., P. W. Schmidt and others refer this to his injunctions concerning joy. But that explanation does not seem to accord with the rest of the verse. "To go on writing the same thing is not irksome (tedious) to me, while for you it is safe." In what cogent sense would it be *safe* to urge them to rejoice? But an excellent meaning is found when we connect the words with the warning that follows. That warning is expressly given for their *safety*. Nothing is more probable than that Paul had frequent correspondence with the Philippians. He must, for instance, have thanked them for their various gifts. In all likelihood, then, **τὰ αὐ.** refers to warnings formerly addressed to them against dangerous teachers apt to lead them astray. He prepares the way for a similar utterance here by a certain tone of apology. Perhaps the slight friction in the Philippian Church, which is hinted at here and there, may have been connected with tendencies in the direction of Judaising. If a connexion is necessary between **χαίρετε** and the subsequent warnings (which is very doubtful in an informal letter like this), it is obvious that the formation of parties (Jewish and heathen-Christian) would, above all things, mar the spirit of Christian joy. [Clemen (*Einheitlichk.*, pp. 139-140) cuts the knot by deriving the latter half of ver. 1 from the redactor. The whole section from iii. 2 to iv. 3 belongs to an old letter to the Philippians. Chap. iv. 4 is the continuation of chap. iii. 1a.] Franke, on the occurrence of this strong warning towards the close of the letter, well compares the parallel case of Luther who, in prospect of death, could not depart without wishing for his followers not only the blessing of God but also hatred of the Pope (Myr.,[5] p. 13).

Ver. 2. It is difficult to understand how anyone could find three different classes in these words (*e.g.*, Ws., who divides them into (*a*) unconverted heathens, (*b*) self-seeking Christian teachers, (*c*) unbelieving Jews. See also his remarks in *A. J. Th.*, i., 2, pp. 389-391). The words are a precise parallel to Paul's denunciations of Judaising teachers in Galatians and 2 Corinthians. *Cf.* Gal. i. 7, 9, v. 12, 2 Cor. xi. 13, ii. 17. The persistent and malicious opposition which they maintained against him sufficiently accounts for the fiery vehemence of his language. To surrender to their teaching was really to renounce the most precious gift of the Gospel, namely, "the glorious liberty of the sons of God". For, in Paul's view, he who possesses the Spirit is raised above all law. *Cf.* 2 Cor. iii. 17, and see Gunkel, *Wirkungen*[2], etc., pp. 96-98.—**βλέπετε.** Thrice repeated in the intense energy of his invective. Literally = "look at" them, in the sense of "beware of" them. It is not so used in classical Greek. Apparently some such significance as this is found in 2 Chron. x. 16, **βλέπε τὸν οἶκόν σου, Δαυείδ.** Frequent in N.T. (see Blass, *Gram.*, p. 87, *n.* 1). He would have used a stronger word than **βλ.** had the Judaisers already made some progress at Philippi. There is nothing to suggest this in the Epistle. But all the Pauline Churches were exposed to their inroads. At any moment their emissaries might appear.—**τοὺς κύνας.** Only here in Paul. Commentators have tried to single out the point of comparison intended, some emphasising the *shamelessness* of dogs, others their

[f] **κατατομήν· 3. ἡμεῖς γάρ ἐσμεν ἡ** [g] **περιτομή, οἱ πνεύματι Θεῷ** [1] f See note *infr.*
[h] **λατρεύοντες, καὶ** [i] **καυχώμενοι ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἐν σαρκὶ** [2] g See note *infr.*
h Luke i. 74; Rom. i. 9; 2 Tim. i. 3 *al.* Freq. in LXX, *e.g.*, Josh. xxiv. 14.
i More than thirty exx. in Paul; *e.g.*, Rom. ii. 23, v. 11. *Cf.* Jer. ix. 23, 24; Sir. l. 20 (num. exx. in Sir.).

[1] So ℵcD*P, d, e, f, m, vg. go. syrsch. et p. txt. arm. æth., Chr., Victorin., Ambrst. Edd. **Θεου** with ℵ*ABCDcEFGKL, cop. syrp. mg., Eus., Euth.cod., Ath.

[2] **και ου σαρκι** Dgr.Egr.

impurity, others their *roaming tendencies*, others still their *insolence* and *cunning*. Most probably the Apostle had no definite characteristic in his mind. **κύων** was a term of reproach in Greek from the earliest to the latest times. *E.g.*, Hom., *Il.*, xiii., 623. Often in O.T. So here.—**τ. κακ. ἐργ.** *Cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 13, **ἐργάται δόλιοι.** We have here clear evidence that the persons alluded to were within the Christian Church. They did professedly carry on the work of the Gospel, but with a false aim. This invalidates the arguments of Lips., Hltzm. and M'Giffert (*Apost. Age*, pp. 389-390), who imagine that the Apostle refers to unbelieving Jews, probably at Philippi. —**τ. κατατομήν.** A scornful parody of their much-vaunted **περιτομή.** W-M. (pp. 794-796) gives numerous exx. of a similar paronomasia, *e.g.*, Diog. Laert., 6, 24, **τὴν μὲν Εὐκλείδου σχολὴν ἔλεγε χολήν, τὴν δὲ Πλάτωνος διατριβὴν κατατριβήν.** Lit. = "the mutilation". Their mechanical, unspiritual view of the ancient rite reduces it to a mere laceration of the body. The word occurs in *CIG.*, 160, 27; Theophr., *Hist. Plant.*, 4, 8, 10; Symm. on *Jerem.*, xlviii., 37 = notch, cutting, incision. It is only found here with any reference to circumcision.

Ver. 3. **ἡμεῖς.** The contrast drawn, which has already been before his mind in the ironical expression **κατατομή.**—**ἡ περιτ.** In LXX it is only found in Gen. xvii. 12, Exod. iv. 25 (Jer. xi. 16 has another sense). The verb **περιτέμνω** is very common. Perhaps the choice of this particular compound to denote the rite of circumcision is due, as Dsm. (*BS.*, p. 151) suggests, to the Egyptian use of it as a technical term for the same custom, long in vogue among the Egyptians. Examples are found in the Papyri. Paul uses it here in its strict sense as a token of participation in the covenant with God and of obligation to maintain it. But the further idea belonged to it of being the outward symbol of an inward grace. *Cf.* Deut. xxx. 6. As the rite was regarded essentially as one of purification, the grace associated with it was a cleansing process. This explains expressions like that in Jer. ix. 26, etc.—**οἱ . . . λατρεύοντες.** The participle has become a noun denoting a class of men, spiritual worshippers. Contrast Heb. viii. 5, xiii. 10, and *cf.* Heb. ix. 14. Most edd. with a number of high authorities read **Θεοῦ** (see crit. note *supr.*). This gives a peculiar combination: "who worship by the Spirit of God". But the occurrence of **σαρκί** immediately after clearly suggests the favourite Pauline antithesis of **πνεῦμα** and **σάρξ.** In that case **Θεῷ,** which is supported by some excellent evidence, would be the natural reading, governed by **λατρεύοντες.** Aptly parallel is Rom. i. 9, **ὁ Θεὸς ᾧ λατρεύω ἐν τῷ πνεύματί μου.** Certainly **Θεοῦ,** as the more difficult reading, must be considered. But as **λατρεύω** had come to have the technical sense of worshipping God, the word might be altered at an early date to get rid of a superfluity.—**λατρ.** In LXX it is used exclusively of the service of God, true or false. But it is distinguished from its synonym **λειτουργεῖν** as including the worship of the people as well as the ritual of the priests and Levites. See esp. SH. on Rom. i. 9.—**καυχώμενοι.** One of the Apostle's most characteristic words. It expresses with great vividness the high level of Christian life at which he is living: "exulting in Christ Jesus". It belongs to the same triumphant mood which finds utterance so often in this Epistle in **χαίρω.** This victorious Christian gladness ought to sweep them past all earthly formalism and bondage to "beggarly elements".—**οὐκ ἐν σ. πεποιθ. οὐκ** (instead of **μή**) emphasises the *actual* condition of their own Christian life.—**ἐν σαρκί.** On the phrase see Dsm., *N.T. Formel "in Christo,"* p. 125, who regards it as following the analogy of the Pauline **ἐν Χριστῷ.** This is manifestly so in our instance where the expressions stand in juxtaposition. *Carnem appellat quicquid est extra Christum* (Calvin). Here **σάρξ** has a double antithesis, both **X. Ἰ.** and

k 2 Cor. viii. 22; Eph. iii. 12 *al.* Once in LXX, 2 Kings xviii. 19.

πεποιθότες· 4. καίπερ ἐγὼ ἔχων [k]πεποίθησιν καὶ[1] ἐν σαρκί· εἴ τις [1]δοκεῖ ἄλλος[2] πεποιθέναι ἐν σαρκί, ἐγὼ μᾶλλον· 5. περιτομῇ[3] [m]ὀκταήμερος, ἐκ [n]γένους [o]Ἰσραήλ, [o]φυλῆς Βενιαμίν,[4] [p]Ἑβραῖος ἐξ

Condemned by Atticists. See Rutherford, *New Phryn.*, 355. 1 See note *infr.* m Only here in N.T. See note *infr.* 21; Rom. xi. 1 *al.* LXX. n 2 Cor. xi. 26; Gal. i. 14. Freq. in this sense in LXX. o Acts xiii. p 2 Cor. xi. 22.

[1] Om. **και** D*E*FG, 4, 30, 73, d, e, f, g, Zahn (*Luthardt's Zeitschr.*, 1885, p. 184).

[2] **αλλος δοκει** DEFG, 73, 74, O.L. vg. go. syrp., Victorin.

[3] Edd. with overwhelming weight of authority **περιτομῃ**.

[4] So Alf. with DE. Ti., Trg., W.H., Ws. **Βενιαμειν** with ℵABL 37*, 47, Euth.cod.

πνεύματι. The ordinary use of "self" in the popular religious vocabulary corresponds with wonderful accuracy to the Pauline **σάρξ** (so also Moule). For a strangely kindred conception *cf.* Seneca, *ad Marc.*, 24, 5: *illi* (*animo*) *cum hac carne grave certamen est* (quoted by Hltzm., *N.T. Th.*, ii., p. 21). Of course **σάρξ** has become a technical term in Paul's controversy with the Judaisers, and that particular side of its meaning must always be kept in view (see Romans and Galatians *passim*).—**πεποιθ.** The word occurs no less than six times in this short Epistle. Paul has reached firm convictions on the highest things. He *knows* what he believes and what he rejects. That is the real explanation of his strong, exultant joy.

Vv. 4-6. PAUL'S CONFIDENCE IN THE FLESH.—Ver. 4. A very close parallel to the thought is found in 2 Cor. xi. 18-23. —**καίπερ . . . ἔχων.** A rare construction in N.T. Three exx. occur in Hebrews. Viteau (who regards it as a survival of the literary language, see *Le Verbe*, p. 189) would resolve the clause and its context into **εἰ καὶ ἔχω πεποίθησιν καὶ ἐν σαρκί, ἡμεῖς ἐσμὲν οὐκ ἐν σαρκὶ πεποιθότες** (p. 117), which seems a reasonable explanation.—**πεποίθησιν.** The Apostle realised to the full what was involved in being a Jew. He felt the high prerogatives of the chosen people of God. *Cf.* Rom. iii. 1-2. They were the heirs of the promises in a unique manner. But these remarkable privileges ought to have produced in them willing submission to God's universal purpose of mercy instead of being incentives to mere self-complacency and bitter prejudice.—**καὶ ἐν σ.** Zahn (see crit. note *supr.*) omits **καί** with some good authorities, assigning its origin to a false exegesis which believed that Paul *had* some fleshly trust besides his Christian boasting. But **καί** seems quite in place, as Paul is simply, for the moment, regarding himself from a purely Jewish standpoint.—**εἴ τις δ. πεπ.** "If anyone else presumes to trust." A complete parallel is Matt. iii. 9, **μὴ δόξητε λέγειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς.** *Cf.* 1 Cor. xi. 16. Akin to this use of **δοκεῖν** is such a passage as Aristoph., *Ran.*, 564, **μαίνεσθαι δοκῶν,** "Pretending to be mad". We cannot help thinking that the usage is based on the *impersonal* use of the verb. In later Greek **δοκεῖν** frequently means "think," *e.g.*, Acts xxvii. 13; *Acta Philip.*, 95, 1; Plut., *Timol.*, viii., 3. In official Greek it is the regular equivalent of Latin *censere*, the technical term to denote the opinion of the Senate (see Viereck, *Sermo Graecus*, etc., p. 72). Holst. acutely notes that "**δοκεῖ** puts the **πεποιθ. ἐν σ.** subjectively, and denies that there is a reality corresponding to this false opinion. In this subjectivity there is irony."

Ver. 5. The Apostle seems to feel a certain natural pride in recounting his hereditary privileges. — **περιτομῇ ὀκταήμ.** The dative of **περιτ.** must be read, expressing the sphere to which **ὀκταήμ.** belongs. Literally: "Eight-days-old as regards my circumcision". A.V. satisfies the requirements. He was born in Judaism, and lost none of its advantages from the outset. Proselytes were circumcised as adults. For the usage in this sense see the elaborate list of parallels in Wetstein on John xi. 39.—**ἐκ γένους Ἰ. ἐκ** often denotes the class or country of a man, *e.g.*, John iii. 1. Paul shared in the glories of the covenant-people. Israel was the theocratic name. —**φυλῆς Β.** This tribe stood high in Jewish estimation, not only as descending from Rachel, Jacob's best-loved wife, but as remaining loyal to the house of David, and, after the exile, forming with Judah

Ἑβραίων, κατὰ νόμον Φαρισαῖος, 6. κατὰ [q]ζῆλον[1] [r]διώκων τὴν[2] ἐκκλησίαν,[3] κατὰ δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐν νόμῳ γενόμενος ἄμεμπτος.

q Rom. x. 2; *cf.* 2 Cor. vii. 11, ix. 2; 1 Macc. ii. 58 (A).
r Acts xxii. 4; 1 Cor. xv. 9; Gal. i. 23 *al.*

[1] So ℵcDb et cEKLP, Euth.cod., Bas.eth. Edd. ζηλος with ℵ*ABD*FG.
[2] Om. D*FG. [3] Θεου added by FG, 122, f, vg., Aug., Ambrst.

the foundation of the future nation.—**Ἑβρ. ἐξ Ἑβρ.** For the phrase *cf.* Herodt., 2, 143, **Πίρωμιν ἐκ Πιρώμιος**; Plat., *Phaedr.*, 246 A, **ἀγαθοὶ καὶ ἐξ ἀγαθῶν.** The force of these words has been variously estimated. Lft. and others draw a contrast between **Ἑβραῖος** and **Ἑλληνιστής,** the former being a Jew who retained the Hebrew language and customs (see Acts vi. 1). But Euseb., *H.E.*, 2, 4, 2, applies the designation to Philo, and in *Praep. Evang.*, xiii., 11, 2, to Aristobulus, both of them Greek-speaking Jews with little if any knowledge of Hebrew. *Cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 22. The Greek Comm., Th. Mps. and Thdrt., believe that, in using the ancient name, Paul wishes to emphasise the purity of his lineage. Probably they are right.—**κατὰ νόμον.** Are we to distinguish between **νόμος** and **ὁ νόμος** in Paul? Attempts have been made (notably that of Gifford, *Romans* in *Speaker's Comm.*, pp. 41-48) to show that when Paul omits the article he is thinking mainly of the principle of law as a method of justification in opposition to faith, etc. In our judgment it has been made abundantly clear by Grafe (*Die paulinische Lehre vom Gesetz*, pp. 1-11) that, for the Apostle, **νόμος** with or without the article means the O.T. revelation of the will of God. He makes no distinction between a general conception of Divine law and the special one of the Mosaic law. The Mosaic law is for him the Divine law pure and simple, and therefore has a universal bearing. There are, of course, modifications of this central idea, but they can all be satisfactorily accounted for. Often the insertion or omission of the article with **νόμος** is entirely a question of formal grammar. Here **νόμος** is plainly the law of Moses. —**Φαρισαῖος.** *Cf.* Acts xxiii. 6. For an interesting discussion of the influence of the school of Hillel upon Paul see Wabnitz, *Revue Théol.*, xiii., p. 287 ff. The survivals of Rabbinic doctrines and methods in Paul's thought, however, must neither be exaggerated, nor, because they are Rabbinic, be contemptuously dismissed. "If God was not moving in the Rabbinic thought of Christ's day, what reason have we to say He . . . moves in the thought of to-day?" (P. T. Forsyth). Almost certainly Paul's family must have been in thorough sympathy with strict Judaism. No doubt he would be disowned by them, and this, as Ramsay notes (*St. Paul*, p. 36), would give special force to his words in ver. 8 *infr.*

Ver. 6. Probably **ζῆλος** (neuter) is the correct form here. In N.T. the neuter occurs only in 2 Cor. ix. 2, but it is found in Ignat., and, alternately with **ὁ ζ.**, in 1 Clem. It is perhaps colloquial (so W-Sch., p. 84), although **ὁ ζ.** is that used in LXX. **ζῆλος** would almost have a technical meaning for a strict Jew at that time in connexion with the fanatical party among the Pharisees who called themselves **ζηλωταί** (*cf.* Schürer, i., 2, p. 80 ff.). *Cf.* Gal. i. 14, **περισσοτέρως ζηλωτὴς ὑπάρχων τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων.—διώκ. τ. ἐκκλησ.** *Cf.* Gal. i. 13, **ἐδίωκον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. ὁ διώκων** is, in classical Greek, the technical term for the "pursuer" or prosecutor in the law-courts. Strangely enough it was by means of prosecutions that Paul usually persecuted.—**κατὰ δικ. τ. ἐν ν.** "According to (*i.e.*, tested by the standard of) the righteousness which belongs to the sphere of the law." Of course this righteousness, which is here equivalent to right conduct as a whole, is regarded from the point of view of that which justifies before God. For the exceptional prominence which *righteousness* has in Jewish religious thought, see esp. Weber, *Lehren des Talmud*, pp. 269-270, and Charles' admirable note on *Apocal. of Baruch*, xxiv. 1. *Cf.* Ps. Sol. ix. 9 for a very precise formulation of Jewish thought on this subject. It would be wrong to limit **δικ.** here merely to ceremonial observances. It includes, most probably, the ordinary moral precepts of the law as well.—**ἄμεμπτος.** Exactly parallel to this description is the case of the rich young man in the Gospels. He also could claim to be **κατὰ δικ. τ. ἐν νομ. ἄμεμπ.** It was at the next step (ver. 7) that

s See note *infr.*, and on chap. i. 21.
t *Cf.* Acts xxvii. 21.
u Rom. ix. 20, x. 18.
v See W-M., p. 294.
w 2 Cor. x. 5; 2 Pet. iii. 18 *al.* (Freq. in Paul.)
x Matt. xvi. 26; 1 Cor. iii. 15.
y Only here in N.T. Common in later Greek.

7. ἀλλ' ἅτινα[1] ἦν μοι [s]κέρδη, ταῦτα ἥγημαι διὰ τὸν Χριστὸν [t]ζημίαν.
8. ἀλλὰ [u]μενοῦνγε[2] καὶ[3] ἡγοῦμαι πάντα ζημίαν εἶναι διὰ τὸ [v]ὑπερ-
ἔχον τῆς [w]γνώσεως Χριστοῦ[4] Ἰησοῦ[5] τοῦ Κυρίου μου[6]· δι' ὃν τὰ
πάντα [x]ἐζημιώθην, καὶ ἡγοῦμαι [y]σκύβαλα εἶναι,[7] ἵνα Χριστὸν

[1] Ti. **ατινα** alone with ℵ*AG, 17, d, e, g, Euth.cod., Cyr., Lucif., Amb.

[2] So Ti., Ws., W.H. with ℵAP, 17, 37, k$^{scr.}$, o$^{scr.}$, cop., Did., Euth.cod., Cyr., Thphl. Trg., Alf., Myr., Lft. **μεν ουν** with BDEFGKL, Chr. See Ws., *TK.*, p. 104.

[3] Om. **και** ℵ*, 80, f, vg$^{cle.}$ go. cop. æth., Cyr., Lucif. See Ws., *TK.*, p. 110, who points out that **και** is often omitted even in ancient MSS.

[4] **του Χ. Ι.**: B, Thdrt. Prob. to conform to **διὰ τὸν Χ.** or **τῆς γνώσ.** See Ws., *TK.*, p. 73.

[5] **Ιησ. Χρισ.** AKP, f, vg. go. syr$^{sch.}$ æth., Bas., Chr., Euth.

[6] **ημων** AP, syr$^{p.}$ arm. æth., Did., Bas., Cyr., Lucif.

[7] So Alf. with ℵcADcEKLP, syr$^{p.}$ go., Did., Bas., Chr., Cyr., Aug. Om. **ειναι** edd. with ℵ*BD*FG, 17, d, e, f, g, vg. cop. syr$^{sch.}$ arm. æth., Lucif., Victorin. There is some force in Meyer's argument that **ειναι** might easily drop out before **ινα**.

he stopped short. He was unable to "count all things loss for Christ".

Vv. 7-9. EARTHLY GAINS COUNTED LOSS THAT HE MIGHT WIN CHRIST.—Ver. 7. **ἀλλ' ἅτινα.** Although in later Greek **ὅστις** had lost almost all its peculiar force and become simply = **ὅς** (*e.g.*, Matt. xxii. 2, etc. *Cf.* Jebb in Vincent and Dickson's *Handbook*, p. 302), one feels that something of that force is present here. "But these things, although they were of a class that was really gain to me." *Non de ipsa lege loquitur, sed de justitia quae in lege est* (Estius). The prerogatives mentioned above were real privileges viewed from his old Jewish standpoint, might even be justly regarded as paving the way to salvation.—**κέρδη.** In the plural it usually refers to money (see Jebb on Soph., *Antig.*, 1326). Perhaps the idea of separate items of profit is before the Apostle's mind (so also Vaughan). For the antithesis between **κέρδη** and **ζημίαν** *cf.* Aristotle, *Eth. Nicom.*, 5, 4, 6, **τὸ μὲν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ πλέον τοῦ κακοῦ δὲ ἔλαττον κέρδος, τὸ δὲ ἐναντίον ζημία.**—**ἥγημαι . . . ζημ.** "I have considered and still consider." Tersely, Thdrt., **περιττὸς . . . ὁ λύχνος, τοῦ ἡλίου φανέντος.**

On vv. 8-11 see Rainy's admirable exposition in *Expos. Bible*, pp. 200-256.—Ver. 8. **ἀλλὰ μενοῦνγε.** Probably **γε** ought to be read (see crit. note *supr.*), as its absence in some good authorities is accounted for by the ease with which it could be omitted (so D omits it in 2 Cor. xi. 16; DFG in Rom. viii. 32; B in Rom. ix. 20). Almost = "Nay, that is a feeble way of expressing it; I can go further and say," etc. **ἀλλά** suggests a contrast to be introduced, **μέν** adds emphasis, while **οὖν,** gathering up what has already been said, corrects it by way of extending his assertion (**γε** can scarcely be translated, representing, rather, a tone of the voice in taking back the limitations implied in **ἅτινα . . . κέρδη**). "Nay rather, I actually count *all* things," etc. We cannot well see, in view of the natural translation of **ἀλλὰ μενοῦνγε,** how the emphasis could be laid on any other word than **πάντα.** There is no need for contrasting **ἥγημαι** and **ἡγοῦμαι.** He does not compare present and past. **ἥγημαι** already expresses the fixed decision to which he has come. He has spoken of regarding his important Jewish prerogatives as "loss" for Christ's sake. Now he widens the range to **πάντα.** This is the goal of Christian life. It is not to be divided up between Christ and earthliness. It is not to express itself in attention to certain details. "If we should say *some* things, we might be in danger of sliding into a one-sided puritanism" (Rainy, *op. cit.*, p. 191).—**τὸ ὑπερέχον τ. γνώσ. Χ. Ἰ. κ.τ.λ.** An instance of the extraordinary predilection of the later language for forming abstract substan-

κερδήσω, 9. καὶ [z]εὑρεθῶ ἐν αὐτῷ, μὴ ἔχων ἐμὴν[1] δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ νόμου, ἀλλὰ τὴν διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ, τὴν ἐκ Θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην

[z] Luke xvii. 18; Rom. vii. 10; 1 Cor. iv. 2 *al.*

[1] ℵ* places **εμ.** after **δικ.**

tives from adjectives and participles. *Cf.* 2 Cor. iv. 17, **τὸ . . . ἐλαφρὸν τῆς θλίψεως ἡμῶν.** Probably = "the surpassing (or supreme) thing which consists in the knowledge," etc. "We beheld His glory." That glory outshines all this earth's guiding-stars.—**τ. γνώσεως.** This knowledge on which Paul is so fond of dwelling is, as Beysch. well expresses it, "the reflection of faith in our reason" (*op. cit.*, ii., p. 177). It is directly connected with the surrender of the soul to Christ, but, as Paul teaches, that always means a close intimacy with Him, from which there springs an ever-growing knowledge of His spirit and will. Such knowledge lays a stable foundation for the Christian character, preventing it from evaporating into a mere unreasoning emotionalism. The conception,which is prominent in Paul's writings, is based on the O.T. idea of the knowledge of God. That is always practical, religious. To know God is to revere Him, to be godly, for to know Him is to understand the revelation He has given of Himself. *Cf.* Isa. xi. 2, Hab. ii. 14. It is natural that in the later Epistles this aspect of the spiritual life should come into the foreground, seeing that already the Christian faith was being confronted by other explanations of man's relation to God. To know Christ, the Apostle teaches, is to have the key which will unlock all the secrets of existence viewed from the standpoint of religion.—**τοῦ Κυρίου μ.** It was as **Κύριος,** the exalted Lord, that Paul first knew Christ. And always it is from this standpoint he looks backwards and forwards. To recognise this is to understand his doctrinal teaching.—**δι' ὃν τ. πάντα ἐζημιώθην. τὰ πάντα** = "the sum-total" as opposed to a part. (So also Holst.) Perhaps in contrasting **ἐζημ.** and **κερδήσω,** as in the similar contrast in ver. 7, he may have in view our Lord's words in Matt. xvi. 26. In N.T. only the passive of **ζημιόω** is used with various constructions. [It gives good sense to regard **καὶ ἡγ. σκύβ.** as a parenthesis, and thus to make **ἵνα κερδ.** along with its parallel **τοῦ γνῶναι** depend on **ἐζημ.** In this case the Apostle speaks from the standpoint of his conversion. See J. Weiss, *Th. LZ.*, 1899, col. 264.]—**σκύβαλα.** The derivation is uncertain. It is most probably connected with **σκῶρ,** "dung". It is often used in this sense itself, but also in the wider meaning of any "refuse," such as the remains of a banquet. See a large collection of exx. from late writers in Wetstein and Lft., and *cf.* the apt parallel in Plautus, *Truc.*, ii., 7, 5, *Amator qui bona sua pro stercore habet.* Probably **εἶναι** ought to be omitted, although there is great divergence in the authorities. (See crit. note *supr.*) It might easily be inserted as parallel to the preceding **εἶναι.—ἵνα Χ. κερδήσω.** "That I may win Christ." There is nothing mechanical or fixed about fellowship with Christ. It may be interrupted by decay of zeal, the intrusion of the earthly spirit, the toleration of known sins, the easy domination of self-will, and countless other causes. Hence, to maintain it, there must be the continuous estimating of earthly things at their true value. Accordingly he looks on "winning Christ" as something present and future, not as a past act. (As to the form, an aorist **ἐκέρδησα** is found in Herod., Joseph., LXX, etc. See Kühner-Blass, *Gramm.*, ii., p. 457.)

Ver. 9. **εὑρεθῶ.** It is probably used here in the semi-technical sense which it received in post-classical Greek = **τυγχάνω** with participle (French *se trouver*), "turn out actually to be". "And actually be in Him," from the eschatological standpoint (see Viteau, *Le Verbe*, p. 192). The idea is involved of a revelation of real character. *Cf.* Gal. ii. 17, **εἰ δὲ . . . εὑρέθημεν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἁμαρτωλοί.—ἐν αὐτῷ.** The central fact of Paul's religious life and thought, the complete identification of the believer with Christ.—**μὴ ἔχων. μή** either depends directly on **ἵνα** or is used to express Paul's own view of what is implied in **εὑρεθ. ἐν α.** This last thought must be regarded as the basis on which the clauses immediately following rest.—**ἐμὴν δικ.** "A righteousness of my own." *Cf. Apoc. of Bar.*, lxiii. 3, "then Hezekiah trusted in his works and had hope in his righteousness". The noun **δικ.** is anarthrous to emphasise the idea belonging to it in its essential force. **ἐμήν** is

a Luke i. 73; Rom. vi. 6, vii. 3. See Blass, *Gramm.*, p. 231. b 2 Cor. i. 5; 1 Pet. iv. 13.

ἐπὶ[1] τῇ πίστει· 10. [a]τοῦ γνῶναι αὐτόν, καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὴν[2] κοινωνίαν τῶν[3] [b]παθημάτων αὐτοῦ,

[1] D*E*, O.L. vg. εν πιστει. LP, syrp., Baseth., Chr., connect this clause with the words following.

[2] So DEFGKLP, Bas., Chr., Euth.cod., Thdrt. Edd. om. την with ℵ*AB. Meyer keeps την, which he supposes to have been "overlooked as unnecessary".

[3] So Lach., Alf. with ℵcADEFGKLP. Ti., Trg., Ws., W.H. om. των with ℵ*B.

added to define, and then the definition is elaborated by the clause with the article. An instructive parallel is Gal. ii. 20, **ἐν πίστει ζῶ τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ** (see an important note in Green, *Gram. of N.T.*, pp. 34-35). **δικαιοσύνη**, as usually in Paul's writings, means a *right relation* between him and God. The retention of the word by Paul to denote the position of the Christian before God is, as Holst. (*Paulin. Theol.*, p. 64) points out, a proof of his close connexion with the Jewish consciousness. We may call it a "forensic" word, for certainly there always lies behind it the idea of a standard appointed by God, a law, the expression of the Divine will. The qualifying words here show what Paul has in view.—**τὴν ἐκ νόμου.** *Cf.* the lament for the destruction of Jerusalem in *Apoc. of Bar.*, lxvii. 6, "the vapour of the smoke of the incense of righteousness which is by the law is extinguished in Zion" (and see Charles' note on xv. 5). This hypothetical **δικ.**, which he calls his own, could only spring from complete conformity to the will of God as revealed in precepts and commands. That is the kind of relation to God which Paul has found to be impossible. On **νόμος** without the article see on ver. 5 *supr.* **τὴν διὰ πίστεως Χ., τὴν ἐκ Θεοῦ δικ. ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει.** The exact character of this **δικαιοσύνη** which Paul prizes must be carefully noted. The presupposition of possessing it is "to be found in Christ". It is not a righteousness which he can win by legal observances. It springs from God. What does this new relation to God precisely mean? The one condition of understanding the Apostle's language is to remember that he combines in his thinking two conceptions of **δικαιοσύνη**, or perhaps we should rather say that his own experience has made vivid for him a two-sided conception of this relation. On the one hand, he thinks of **δικ.** as connected with God, the Judge of men. God, strictly marking sin, might condemn men absolutely, because all have sinned. Instead of that, because of His grace manifested in Jesus Christ the crucified and working through Christ's death, He deals mercifully with sinners, *treats them as righteous on account of the propitiation made by the Righteous One*, treats them as standing in a right relation to Himself, *i.e.*, pardons them. **δικαιοσύνη** thus comes to be God's gracious way of dealing with us, "forgiveness with the Forgiver in it" (Rainy, *op. cit.*, p. 231), the relation with God into which we are brought by His grace for Jesus' sake, regarded more or less as an activity of His, practically = salvation (which, already in O.T., rested upon the rectitude of God's character, see, *e.g.*, Isa. li. 5-8, Ps. xcviii. 2). God's justifying of us makes us **δίκαιοι** in His sight: we possess **δικαιοσύνη.** That, however, might appear arbitrary. But the Apostle gives no ground for such a suspicion. This **δικ. ἐκ Θεοῦ** is only reached "through the faith of Christ," *i.e.*, the faith which Christ kindles, of which He is the author, which, also, He nourishes and maintains (see esp. Haussleiter, *Greifswald. Studien*, pp. 177-178). This **δικ.** is securely founded on faith in Christ (**ἐπὶ τῇ π.**). But what does such faith effect? It is that which makes the believer one with Christ. He shares in all that his Lord possesses. Christ imparts life to him. Christ's relation to the Father becomes his. But this is no longer a being regarded or dealt with by God as if he were **δίκαιος.** Union with Christ makes it possible for the Christian to *be* **δίκαιος**, to show himself such in actual behaviour. Thus **δικαιοσύνη** may express something more than the relation to God into which believers are brought by God's justifying judgment (which for their experience means the sense of forgiveness with the Forgiver in it). It embraces the conduct which is the response to that forgiving love of God, a love only bestowed on the soul united to Christ by

faith (see esp. Pfleid., *Paulin.*, i., p. 175; Hltzm., *N.T. Th.*, ii., pp. 127-129, 138-139; Häring, **Δικ. Θεοῦ** *bei Paulus*, Tübingen, 1896; Kölbing, *SK.*, 1895, 7 ff.; Denney, *Expos.*, vi., 3, p. 433 ff., 4, p. 299 ff., Holst., *Paulin. Th.*, pp. 65-66).

Vv. 10-11.—Conformity to Christ's death and resurrection. — Ver. 10. **τοῦ γνῶναι.** This infinitive of purpose or motive is frequent in N.T. and later Greek. Among classical authors it is chiefly found in Thucyd., who favours it (see Goodwin, *MT.*, p. 319; Viteau, *Le Verbe*, p. 169 ff.). It is perhaps connected with the use of the genitive after verbs of aiming, hitting, etc. Paul has already spoken in ver. 8 of the **γνῶσις** of Christ. This thought again appeals to him, but now as being the natural development of winning Christ and being found in Him. For with Paul this Christian Gnosis is the highest reach of Christian experience. *Cf.* Wordsworth, *Excursion*, Bk. iv. :—

> For knowledge is delight, and such delight
> Breeds love: yet suited as it rather is
> To thought and to the climbing intellect,
> It teaches less to love than to adore;
> If that be not indeed the highest love.

γνῶσις is the necessary result of intimate communion with Christ. No better comment on the thought can be found than Eph. i. 11-20. *Cf.*, as a most instructive parallel, John xvii. 3. The precise force of **γνῶναι** as opposed to **εἰδέναι κ.τ.λ.** is admirably brought out by Lft. on Gal. iv. 9, where he shows that **γν.** (1) has in view "an earlier state of ignorance" or "some prior facts on which the knowledge is based," and (2) contains "the ideas of thoroughness, familiarity, or of approbation". **γν.** emphasises "the *process* of redemption".—**τὴν δύναμιν τ. ἀνασ. . . . κοινωνίαν παθημ. . . . συμμορφ. . . . τῷ θανάτῳ.** As to readings, **τήν** must be omitted (with the best authorities) before **κοιν.**, because the latter forms *one* idea with the preceding clause. In the case of **τῶν** it is more difficult to decide. But the evidence, both external and internal, is, on the whole, against it. **συμμορφιζόμενος** is clearly right, having unassailable attestation.—In this passage we have the deepest secrets of the Apostle's Christian experience unveiled. *Qui expertus non fuerit, non intelliget* (Anselm). Two experiences are described which cannot be separated: the experimental knowledge of the believer embraces (1) the power of Christ's resurrection, (2) the fellowship of His sufferings, conformity to His death. Paul puts the resurrection first, because it was the Risen Christ he came to know; it was that knowledge which gave him insight into the real meaning of Christ's sufferings and death. But here he thinks altogether of a spiritual process which is carried on in the soul of him who is united to Christ. He has no idea of martyrdom before him (so, *e.g.*, De W., Myr.). Nor is any earthly suffering present to his mind except, perhaps, as a discipline which overcomes sin. Thus Col. i. 24 is not a true parallel (so also Hpt.). The passages which illuminate his meaning are especially Rom. vi. 3-12, viii. 29, Gal. ii. 19-20, vi. 14. Christ, in Paul's view, carries the man who clings to Him in faith through all the great crises which came to Him on the path of His perfecting. The deepest of men's saving experiences run parallel, as it were, to the cardinal events of the Christian revelation, more especially to that atoning death accomplished once for all for the remission of sins. *Cf.* Rom. vi. 5, **σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ.** This is the "crucifying of the flesh" in fellowship with Christ, which results in "newness of life" (Rom. vi. 4). On the Cross Christ died, *i.e.*, the earthly part in Him died—His human flesh. But that was the only element in Him that could be tempted. And, as regards that element of His being, He died victorious, able to offer up His human life without spot unto God. They that are Christ's are enabled, by His power communicated to them, through a process of overcoming, to die to earthliness and the appeals made to their fleshly nature. But in dying on the Cross Christ identified Himself with the sin of the world, acknowledging that God's judgment upon sin was righteous and true, as the Head of mankind representing sinners and bearing the burden of their transgression. So, in the Apostle's view, they that are Christ's have the firm assurance that in *Him* the Crucified they have made full confession of their sin to the holy and gracious God. They know, by the witness of the Holy Spirit, that God accepts that confession and forgives them freely and joyfully. For they know that Holiness has accepted Love, and that Love has acknowledged Holiness, or rather, that the holy love of the Father and the Son is revealed in its unity on the Cross of Christ. The result of death with Christ is life in Him. This new life depends on Christ's resurrection. "Because I live, ye shall live also." The *power* (**δύναμιν**) of His resurrection as experienced by the

c True reading
d Acts xxvi. 7; Eph. iv. 13.
e Only here in N.T.
f *Cf.* Heb. ii. 10, v. 9; Wisd. iv. 13.
g See note *infr.*
h Rom. ix. 30; 1 Cor. ix. 24; Sirach xv. 7.

c συμμορφούμενος [1] τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτοῦ, 11. εἴ πως [d] καταντήσω εἰς τὴν [e] ἐξανάστασιν τῶν [2] νεκρῶν. 12. οὐχ ὅτι ἤδη ἔλαβον, ἢ ἤδη [f] τετε-
συμμορφιζόμενος only here in N.T.
λείωμαι [3]. [g] διώκω δέ, εἰ καὶ [4] καταλάβω ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ [5] [h] κατελήφθην [6]

[1] So ℵcDcEKL, Bas., Chr., Thdrt. Ti., Trg., Alf., Ws., W.H. **συμμορφιζομενος** with ℵ*ABD*P, 17, 67**, 71, Euth.cod., Bas. FG, d, e, g, go., Iren., Lucif., Victorin. **συνφορτιζομενος.**

[2] So Myr., with KL, arm. cop. Thdrt., Thphl. Edd. (exc. Myr.) **την εκ νεκρων** with ℵABDEP, 17, 31 *et al.*, d, e, f, g, vg. go. syrr., Ir., Bas., Euth.cod., Chr. Fgr.Ggr., **των εκ.** Myr. supposes that **εκ** was written in margin to explain **εξαν.**, not found elsewhere in N.T., and that so the erroneous insertion of this **εκ** after **των** produced **την εκ νεκ.** This is improbable.

[3] D*EFG, d, e, f, g, Iren., Ambrst. add **η ηδη δεδικαιωμαι** (FG^2 **δικαιωμαι,** G* **δικαιομαι**).

[4] So edd. with ℵcABDcE**KLP, Clem., Eus., Marc., Chr., Euth.cod., Thdrt. Ti. om. **και** with ℵ*D*E*FG, 39, 112, d, e, f, g, vg., Tert., Hil., Victorin., Ambrst.

[5] Om. Dgr.*Egr.Fgr.G, 67**, Tert.

[6] So BcDcEKLP. Edd. **κατελημφθ.** with ℵAB*D*FG.

believer is the effect of His victory over death and sin; that victory which has given Him all power in heaven and earth; which enables Him to impart of His own life to those who are in His fellowship. It is not they who live but "Christ liveth in" them. The *organic* connexion between Christ and the Christian is the regulating idea for the Apostle. Christ is, as we have said, the Head and representative of humanity. Hence conformity to Christ (Rom. viii. 29, **προώρισεν συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ**) all along the line, both in living and dying, is a return to the divinely-purposed type, for man was made in the image of God (see *loc. cit.*, **εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς**). "In this appropriation of the death and rising of the Lord Jesus . . . there are three stages, corresponding to the Friday, Saturday and Sunday of Eastertide. Christ died for our sins: He was buried: He rose again the third day. So, by consequence, 'I am crucified with Christ: no longer do I live: Christ liveth in me'" (Findlay, *Galat.* in *Expos. Bible*, p. 159). On the whole thought of this passage, see Pfleiderer, *Paulinism*, i., pp. 169, 192-207; Denney, *Expos.*, vi., 4, p. 299 ff.

Ver. 11. **εἴ πως καταντ.** This construction closely corresponds to the Homeric usage of **εἴ κε** or **ἤν** (as in *Odyss.*, 3, 83, **πατρὸς ἐμοῦ κλέος μετέρχομαι, ἤν που ἀκούσω**) where the protasis really contains in itself its own apodosis "which consists of an implied idea of purpose" or hope (see Goodwin, *MT.*, p. 180; Burton, *MT.*, § 276; Viteau, *Le Verbe*, pp. 62, 116). Here the clause is almost equivalent to an indirect question. The Resurrection is the Apostle's goal, for it will mean perfect, unbroken knowledge of Christ and fellowship with Him. Paul knows by experience the difficulty of remaining loyal to the end, of being so conformed to Christ's death that the power of sin will not revive its mastery over him. So his apparent uncertainty here of reaching the goal is not distrust of God. It is distrust of himself. It emphasises the need he feels of watchfulness and constant striving (*cf.* **διώκω,** ver. 12), lest "having preached to others" he "be found a castaway" (1 Cor. ix. 27. Vv. 24-27 of this chap., along with Rom. viii. 17, are the best parallel to the passage before us). But, on the other side, he is always reminded that "faithful is He that calleth you" (1 Thess. v. 24).—**καταντήσω.** Probably aorist subjunctive (as corresponding with **καταλάβω** in ver. 12).—**τὴν ἐξαν. τ. νεκρ.** Authority, both external and internal, supports the reading **τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν. ἐξανάστ.** is found nowhere else in N.T., and never in LXX. In later Greek it means "expulsion". It occurs only here in this sense. Holst. suggests that **ἐξαν.** is used here of the actual resurrection, because **ἀνάστασις** was used above of

believers with an ethical, ideal meaning. We are disposed to believe (with Ws. and others) that Paul is thinking only of the resurrection of believers (*cf.* Ps. Sol. iii. 13-16 for Jewish thought on this subject, the thought which had been Paul's mental atmosphere). This is his usual standpoint. In the famous passage 1 Cor. xv. 12 ff. it is exclusively of Christians he speaks. We have no information as to what he taught regarding a general resurrection. But considering that it is with spontaneous, artless letters we have to do, and not with theoretical discussions, it would be hazardous to say that he ignored or denied a general resurrection. For him the resurrection of Christians depends on and is conformed to the resurrection of their Lord. Teichmann (*Auferstehung u. Gericht*, p. 67), comparing chap. i. 23 with this passage, holds that Paul, although he has replaced the idea of resurrection by that of a continuous existence after death, occasionally (as here) uses the traditional *termini technici*. This may be so. More probably at one time he would give prominence to the thought of uninterrupted fellowship with Christ after death, while at another his longings would centre round the great crisis when Christ should acknowledge all His faithful servants and make them full sharers in His glory. It is not to be doubted that Paul, like the rest of the early Christians, expected that crisis soon to come.

Vv. 12-16. THE MARK OF THE MATURE CHRISTIAN,—TO PRESS FORWARD.—Ver. 12. **οὐχ ὅτι.** There is a curious difference (see W-M., p. 746) between the use of this phrase in classical and in N.T. Greek. **λέγω** is understood in both cases, but in the classical language the usage is rhetorical = "not only, but". In N.T. its purpose is to guard against misunderstanding, "I do not mean that," etc.—**ἔλαβον.** The aorist sums up the Apostle's experiences as far as the point he has reached, looking at it (with the usual force of the aorist) as a single fact. In English, of course, we must translate, "Not that I *have* already attained" (so R.V.). In Greek a sharper distinction is made between past and present. *Cf.* John xvii. 4, **ἐγώ σε ἐδόξασα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὸ ἔργον τελειώσας.** It is needless to ask what is the object of **ἔλαβον.** None is required, just as we speak of "attaining". He has in view all that is involved in winning Christ and knowing Him. Probably the remaining verses of this paragraph are a caution to some at Philippi who were claiming high sanctity, and so affecting superior airs towards their brethren. This would naturally lead to irritation and jealousies.—**τετελείωμαι.** The interesting variant **δεδικαίωμαι** (*cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 4) is plainly very ancient, the gloss, probably, of some pious copyist who imagined that the Divine side of sanctification was left too much out of sight. **τελειόω** is a favourite word of the writer to the Hebrews. It means literally "to bring to the end" determined by God. See Bleek, *Heb. Brief.*, ii., 1, p. 299. A striking parallel to our passage is Philo, *Leg. Alleg.*, iii., 23 (ed. Cohn), **πότε οὖν, ὦ ψυχή, μάλιστα νεκροφορεῖν σαυτὴν ὑπολήψῃ; ἆρά γε οὐχ ὅταν τελειωθῇς καὶ βραβείων καὶ στεφάνων ἀξιωθῇς; ἔσῃ γὰρ τότε φιλόθεος, οὐ φιλοσώματος.**—**διώκω.** It is unnecessary to assume the metaphor of the race-course. **δι.** and **καταλαμβάνω** are correlative words (**δι.** esp. frequent in Paul) = "seek and find," "pursue and overtake". *Cf.* Rom. ix. 30, Exod. xv. 9 (LXX). Of course both may be used with a metaphorical colour. *Cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 24, and also 2 Clem. xviii. 2 (quoted by Wohl.). —**εἰ καὶ καταλ.** See on **εἴ πως καταντ.** *supr.* The subjunctive here is deliberative as being in an indirect question (see Blass, *Gramm.*, p. 206). We believe **καί** ought to be read, as it would very easily slip out before **κατ.** It emphasises the correspondence with the following **κατελήμφθην,** and may possibly be a sort of correction of **εἴ πως** in the previous verse, "in the hope that I may really grasp (do *my* part in grasping)". Hpt. quotes aptly from Luther: "ein Christ ist nicht im Wordensein sondern im Werden, darum wer ein Christ ist, ist kein Christ".—**ἐφ' ᾧ.** Two distinct interpretations are possible and equally good. It may (1) be = **ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὅτι,** "for this reason, *viz.*, that I," etc., or (2) = **τοῦτο ἐφ' ᾧ,** "that with a view to which I," etc. Whichever be chosen, the sense remains the same. Paul lays, as it were, the responsibility of his attaining upon Christ. Christ's grasp of his whole being (**κατελήμφθην**) must have a definite purpose in it. Paul's Christian progress is the only thing that can correspond (**καί**) to his experience of Christ's power.—**Χ. Ἰ. τοῦ** is certainly to be omitted. It is difficult to decide whether **Ἰ.** ought to be read or not. There is some force in the remark of Ws. that there would be no motive for adding **Ἰ.**, while **Χ.** alone would follow the analogy of vv. 8-9 (see Ws., *TK.*, p. 88).

ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ.[1] 13. ἀδελφοί, ἐγὼ ἐμαυτὸν οὐ[2] λογίζομαι κατειληφέναι· ἓν δέ, τὰ μὲν ὀπίσω ἐπιλανθανόμενος, τοῖς[3] δὲ ἔμπροσθεν ἐπεκτεινόμενος, 14. κατὰ σκοπὸν διώκω ἐπὶ[4] τὸ

i Rom. iii. 28, xiv. 14 (LXX). k John ix. 25. For ellipse, *cf.* 2 Cor. ix. 6; Gal. ii. 9, v. 13 (see Blass, *Gr.*, 287-288). l See note *infr.* m Heb. vi. 10, xiii. 2 (with genit.). Here alone (in N.T.) with accus. Often with this constrn. in LXX. n This phrase only here in N.T. See note *infr.* o Only here in N.T. p Only here in N.T. Job xvi. 13; Lam. iii. 12; Wisd. v. 12. q See on ver. 12 *supr.*

[1] So KL, Thdrt. Ti., Ws. **Χ. Ι.** with ℵAP, 47, 73, 80, 109, $c^{scr.}$, $f^{scr.}$, syrp. mg. cop. arm., Chr., Aug., Ambrst. Trg., Alf., Myr. **Χ.** with BD*E*FG, 17, 179, d, e, g, go. æth., Clem., Marc., Hil., Victorin.

[2] So Lach., Trg., Alf., Ws. (W.H. mg.) with BD^{c}EFGKL, d, e, f, g, vg. go. syr.sch. et p. arm., Tert., Chr., Victorin. Ti., W.H. (^{r}) **ουπω** with ℵAD$^{gr.*}$P, 17, 23*, 31 *et al.*, cop. æth., Clem., Bas., Euth.$^{cod.}$, Thdrt.

[3] D*FG, d, e, f, g, vg. **εις δε τα.**

[4] So DEFGKLP, Bas., Chr., Thdrt. Edd. **εις** with ℵAB, 17, 73, 80, Clem., Euth.$^{cod.}$, Cyr. Myr. thinks that **επι** is explanatory.

Ver. 13. **ἀδελφοί.** This direct appeal to them shows that he is approaching a matter which is of serious concern both to him and them.—**ἐγὼ ἐμαυτόν.** Why such strong personal emphasis? Is it not a clear hint that there were people at Philippi who prided themselves on having grasped the prize of the Christian calling already? Paul has been tacitly leading up to this. He will yield to none in clear knowledge of the difference between the old and the new life. He knows more surely than any how completely he has broken with the past. Yet, whatever others may say, he must assume the lowly position of one who is still a learner. It makes little difference whether **οὐ** or **οὔπω** be read. The authorities are pretty evenly balanced.—**λογίζομαι.** The word (often used by Paul) has the force of looking back on the process of a discussion and calmly drawing a conclusion. *Cf.* Rom. viii. 18 (with note of SH.). The Apostle expresses his deliberately formed opinion.—**ἕν δέ.** There is no need to supply a verb. His Christian conduct is summed up in what follows. Never has there been a more *unified* life than that of Paul as Apostle and Christian. "When all is said, the greatest art is to limit and isolate oneself" (Goethe).—**τὰ μὲν ὀπ. ἐπιλανθ.** There are a few exx. in classical Greek of **ἐπιλανθ.** with the accusative, *e.g.*, Aristoph., *Nub.*, 631. But in the later language there was an extraordinary extension of the use of the accusative. (See Hatz., *Einl.*, p. 220 ff.) Does **τὰ ὀπ.** mean the old life, or the past stages of Christian experience? If the metaphor were strictly pressed, no doubt the latter alternative would claim attention. But pressing metaphors is always hazardous. And parallel passages seem rather to justify the first meaning, *e.g.*, Jer. vii. 24, **ἐγενήθησαν εἰς τὰ ὄπισθεν καὶ οὐκ εἰς τὰ ἔμπροσθεν** (of disobeying God's commands); Luke ix. 62, **βλέπων εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω**; John vi. 66, **πολλοὶ τῶν μαθητῶν . . . ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω.**—**τοῖς ἔμπρ. ἐπεκτ. τὸ** and **τὰ ἔμπρ.** are found in Herodot. and Xenoph. Wetstein quotes most aptly from Luc., *de Cal.*, 12, **οἷόν τι καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς γυμνικοῖς ἀγῶσιν ὑπὸ τῶν δρομέων γίγνεται· κἀκεῖ γὰρ ὁ μὲν ἀγαθὸς δρομεὺς τῆς ὕσπληγος εὐθὺς καταπεσούσης, μόνον τοῦ πρόσω ἐφιέμενος καὶ τὴν διάνοιαν ἀποτείνας πρὸς τὸ τέρμα κἂν τοῖς ποσὶ τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς νίκης ἔχων, τὸν πλησίον οὐδὲν κακουργεῖ.** In using this comparison, Paul, of course, adapts himself, as among Greeks and Romans, to a custom of their national life. On this kind of adaptation see an excellent discussion in Weizsäcker, *Apost. Zeitalter*, pp. 100-104.

Ver. 14. **κατὰ σκ.** "In the direction of the mark." Exactly parallel is Acts viii. 26, **πορεύου κατὰ μεσημβρίαν.** Perhaps akin are uses like Thucyd., 6, 31, **κατὰ θέαν ἥκειν**; Hom., *Odyss.*, 3, 72, **κατὰ πρῆξιν** ("for the sake of business," Ameis-Hentze). It is needless to distinguish between **σκοπόν** and **βραβεῖον** in the Apostle's thought. Both really point to that unbroken and complete fellowship with Christ which is attained through the power of His resurrection, that resurrection being the condition of the believer's victory over sin and death, and making it possible for him to enter the "house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens". The purified life in heaven is, in a word,

βραβεῖον τῆς [s] ἄνω [t] κλήσεως[1] τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.[2] 15. [r] 1 Cor. ix. 24. ὅσοι οὖν [u] τέλειοι, τοῦτο φρονῶμεν[3]· καὶ εἴ τι [v] ἑτέρως φρονεῖτε, καὶ [s] Gal. iv. 26; Col. iii. 1.

t Rom. xi. 29; Eph. i. 18; Heb. iii. 1 *al.* u See note *infr.* v Only here in N.T.

[1] Tert. apparently reads ανεγκλησεως.

[2] D*EFgr.G, d, e, g εν Κυριω Ι. Χ.

[3] ℵL, 30, 39, 41 *al.*, Clem. φρονουμεν (so Lft. mg.).

both the goal and the prize. Contrast with this exulting thought *Omar Khayyám*, xxxviii.: "The stars are setting and the caravan starts for the dawn of nothing".—**εἰς τὸ βραβ.** The word occurs in Comedy, Inscrr. and N.T. (1 Cor. ix. 24). *Cf.* 1 Clem., v., 5, **ὁ Παῦλος ὑπομονῆς βραβεῖον ὑπέδειξεν,** where it is perhaps suggested by our passage. It is possibly one of those words which must have been common in colloquial Greek (*cf.* the frequent use of **βραβεύς**), but have survived only in a few books. **εἰς** must be read with the best authorities, for, as Lft. notes, "the prize marks the position of the goal". **ἐπί** is an explanatory gloss.—**τῆς ἄνω κλ.** "The upward calling." The Apostle seems to mean that the **βραβεῖον** is the **ἄνω κλῆσις** (so also Lips.). **κλῆσις** is the technical word in the Epistles for that decisive appeal of God to the soul which is made in Jesus Christ: the offer of salvation. Those who listen are designated **κλητοί.** *Cf.* Rom. viii. 30 and Hltzm., *N.T. Th.*, ii., p. 165 ff. This **κλ.** is not merely to "the inheritance of the saints in light". Its effect must be seen in the sanctification of the believer's life on earth. But here the addition of **ἄνω** suggests that the Apostle has before him the final issue of the calling which belongs to those who have endured to the end, who have run with patience the race set before them. The phrase seems to carry much the same meaning as Heb. iii. 1, **κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου.** *Cf.* the suggestive comment of Chr., **τοὺς μάλιστα τιμωμένους τῶν ἀθλητῶν καὶ τῶν ἡνιόχων οὐ στεφανοῦσιν ἐν τῷ σταδίῳ κάτω, ἀλλ' ἄνω καλέσας ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐκεῖ στεφανοῖ.—ἐν Χ. Ἰ.** Although it would give a satisfactory sense to take these words with **διώκω** (so *e.g.*, Myr., Ws.), it is far more natural to join them closely with **τ. ἄνω κλ.** This is emphatically **ἐν Χ. Ἰ.** Only in connexion with Him has the **κλῆσις** either in itself or in its goal any meaning.

Ver. 15. **τέλειοι.** What Paul understands by **τέλ.** we can easily discover from Eph. iv. 13-14, Col. i. 28, iv. 12, 1 Cor. ii. 6 (*cf.* also the definition of the word in Heb. v. 14 taken in connexion with vi. 1). In all these passages **τέλ.** depends upon knowledge, knowledge gained by long experience of Christ, resulting both in firm conviction and maturity of thought and conduct. It has not so much our idea of "perfect" = "flawless," as of "perfect" = "having reached a certain point of completeness," as of one who has come to his full growth, leaving behind him the state of childhood (**νήπιος**). *Cf.* chap. i. 9-10. Lft. supposes a reminiscence of the technical term **τέλειος,** used in the Mysteries to denote the *initiated*, and imagines Paul to speak with a certain irony of people at Philippi who claimed to be in this fortunate position as regards the Christian faith. There is no need to assume here the language of the Mysteries (as Anrich shows, *Das Antike Mysterienwesen*, Gött., 1894, p. 146, *n.* 1), or to find irony in Paul's words. Probably there *were* some (see on ver. 13 *supr.*) at Philippi who boasted of a spiritual superiority to their brethren and who may have called themselves **τέλειοι.** This may have been due to special equipment with the Spirit manifesting itself in speaking with tongues, etc. See 1 Cor. xii. *passim*. But Paul takes the word seriously and points out what it involves. [Wernle's attempt in *Der Christ u. die Sünde bei Paul.*, pp. 6-7, to show that this passage is no argument against Christian perfection which he believes Paul to hold, rests on the erroneous association of **τέλ.** with the Mysteries.] —**τοῦτο φρ.** Let us show our humble conviction that we are still far from the goal which we desire to attain.—**καὶ εἴ . . . ἀποκαλ.** If, in the case of any separate detail of character or knowledge, you imagine yourselves to be **τέλειοι,** to have reached the highest point, God will reveal the truth (the true standpoint of humility) on this matter also. The form of the conditional sentence suggests that Paul knew of persons at Philippi who had erroneous views on

τοῦτο ὁ Θεὸς ὑμῖν ἀποκαλύψει· 16. [w] πλὴν εἰς ὃ [x] ἐφθάσαμεν,[1] τῷ αὐτῷ [y] στοιχεῖν κανόνι, τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν.[1]

17. [z] Συμμιμηταί[2] μου γίνεσθε, ἀδελφοί, καὶ [a] σκοπεῖτε τοὺς οὕτω[3]

w Matt. xxvi. 39; Luke x. 11; Eph. v. 33; Rev. ii. 25.
x Rom. ix. 31; 2 Cor. x. 14; 2 Sam. xx. 13; Cant. ii. 12 *al.* y Gal. v. 25, vi. 16. *Cf.* Rom. iv. 12.
z Only here in N.T. a Chap. ii. 4; Rom. xvi. 17; 2 Cor. iv. 18; Gal. vi. 1.

[1] So ℵ[c]KLP, syrr. æth[pp.], Chr., Dam., Thdrt. Edd. **τω αυτω στοιχειν** (without the words added) with ℵ*AB, 17, 67**, cop. sah. æth[ro.], Hil., Aug. **το αυτο φρονειν, τω αυτω στοιχειν**, DEFG, 23, 31, 37, O.L. vg., Euth.[ocd.], Victorin., Ambrst.

[2] So Trg., Alf. with AB[3]D[c]EKLP. Ti., Ws., W.H. **συνμ** with ℵB*D*FG.

[3] So Ti., W.H. with ℵABD*FG. Trg., Alf., Ws. **ουτως** with D[c]EK[sil.]L[sil.]P, etc. See Ws., *TK.*, p. 64, who thinks that **ουτω** is connected with a similar reading at iv. 1. Both he attributes to the arbitrariness of the copyist.

this subject. But his hint of rebuke is very delicately put. **εἴ τι κ.τ.λ.** It is far-fetched to take this (as Hpt. does) of their judgment on the Judaisers. Paul has forgotten, for the time, the special anxiety which weighs upon him, and has become absorbed in the glorious vista which unfolds itself to the Christian. **καὶ τοῦτο κ.τ.λ.** A firm conviction of the Apostle's. See esp. 1 Cor. ii. 10 (and *cf.* Von Soden, *Abhandlungen C. v. Weizs. gewidmet*, p. 166).

Ver. 16. **πλήν.** It is quite common as introducing a parenthesis. "Only one thing! So far as we have come, keep the path" (Weizs.). For the word *cf.* Schmid, *Atticismus*, i., p. 133, and Bonitz's *Index* to Aristotle.—**εἰς ὃ ἐφθάσ.** In later Greek (as in modern) **φθάνω** has lost all idea of *anticipation* and simply means "come," "reach". *Cf.* 2 Cor. x. 14 (and see Hatz., *Einl.*, p. 199; *Sources of N.T. Greek*, p. 156). "So far as we have come." In what? Ws. thinks in right **φρονεῖν,** connecting the words immediately with **τοῦτο φρονῶμεν.** Kl. supposes the **νόμος δικαιοσύνης,** referring to the earlier part of the chap. (esp. ver. 9). Does he not rather mean the point reached on the advance towards the goal (the **κατὰ σκοπὸν διώκειν**), which is the subject directly before his mind? The very use of **στοιχεῖν** seems to justify this interpretation.—**τῷ αὐτῷ.** It is, at first sight, natural to refer **τ. αὐτ.** immediately to **ὅ** preceding. And this may be right. But there is much force in the interpretation of Lips., who renders "let us walk on the *same* path" (so also Hlst.). The exhortation would then be directed against the difference of opinion and feeling which were certainly present in the Church at Philippi, and is suggested to Paul by the **ἑτέρως φρον.** of ver. 15. That this was an early interpretation is shown by the *v.l.* of *TR.* The words **κανονι το αυτο φρονειν** (not found in the best MSS.) are evidently a gloss on the text. "Only, so far as we have come, let us keep to the same path." **τῷ αὐτῷ** is an instance of a dative common after verbs of "going" and "walking" in N.T. *Cf.* Buttm., *Gram.*, p. 184.—**στοιχεῖν.** An imperatival infinitive found in Hom., Aristoph., Inscrr. (see Meisterhans, *Gram. d. att. Inschrr.*, § 88 A; Viteau, *Le Verbe*, p. 147). Probably this usage is closely connected with the origin of the infinitive, which was a dative, as is shown, *e.g.*, by the infinitive in English, *e.g.*, "to work". This might easily become an imperative, "to work"! Analogous is the use of **χαίρειν** and **ὑγιαίνειν** in Letters. **στ.** is only found in late writers, although, from the frequency of **στοῖχος,** we may infer that it must have existed in earlier times. Literally it means "march in file". Moule well observes that **στ.** more than **περιπατεῖν** (the common word) suggests the *step*, the detail.

Vv. 17-19. A SOLEMN WARNING AGAINST THE EARTHLY, SENSUAL MIND. —Ver. 17. **συμμιμ.** The compound is significant. *Uno consensu et una mente* (Calv.). This emphasis on their unity justifies the interpretation of **τῷ αὐτῷ** favoured above. Paul is compelled to make his own example a norm of the new life. It was not as in Judaism where the Law lay ready to hand as a fixed standard. There was, as yet, no tradition of the Christian life.—**σκοπεῖτε.** A keen, close scrutiny. *Cf.* Rom. xvi. 17 (but there = "mark so as to avoid").—**οὕτω** probably points back to **μου.** It seems more natural to give **καθώς** its common argumentative force, "even as".—**τύπον** = (1) "stamp" of a die, (2) "copy, figure," as the stamp bears a figure on

[b] περιπατοῦντας, [b] καθὼς ἔχετε [e] τύπον ἡμᾶς. 18. πολλοὶ γὰρ περι- [b] Eph. iv. 17; 1 Thess. iv. 1; 1 John ii. 6.
πατοῦσιν, οὓς πολλάκις ἔλεγον ὑμῖν, νῦν δὲ καὶ κλαίων λέγω, τοὺς [c] 2 Thess. iii. 9; 1 Tim. iv. 12; 1 Pet. v. 3 *al.*
[d] ἐχθροὺς τοῦ [e] σταυροῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ· 19. ὧν τὸ [f] τέλος [g] ἀπώλεια, [d] See note *infr.* [e] Contrast Gal. vi. 14.
ὧν ὁ Θεὸς ἡ [h] κοιλία, καὶ ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ [i] αἰσχύνῃ αὐτῶν, οἱ τὰ [f] Rom. vi. 21; 2 Cor. xi. 15; 1 Pet. iv. 17 *al.* [g] See note *infr.* [h] Rom. xvi. 18. *Cf.* 1 Cor. vi. 13; Sirach xxiii. 6. [i] See note *infr.*

the face of the die, (3) "mould, pattern," by transference from the effect to the cause. Wetst. quotes Diod. Sic., *Ex.* (?), **τὸν ἑαυτοῦ βίον εἰς καλῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων μίμησιν ἀρχέτυπον τιθέναι.** See also Radford, *Expositor*, v., 6, p. 380 ff.

Ver. 18. **πολλοὶ κ.τ.λ.** To whom does he refer? Plainly they were persons inside the Christian Church, although probably not at Philippi. This (against Ws.) is borne out by the use of **περιπατεῖν** compared with **περιπατοῦντας** (ver. 17) and **στοιχεῖν** (ver. 16), by **κλαίων** which would have no meaning here if not applied to professing Christians, and further by **ἐχθρούς** which would be a mere platitude if used of heathens or Jews. Some (*e.g.*, Schinz; Hort, Cone, etc.) refer this passage to the same persons as he denounces at the beginning of the chapter, the Judaising teachers. And no doubt they might fitly be called **ἐχθροὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ** (*cf.* Gal. vi. 12-14). But the rest of the description applies far more aptly to professing Christians who allowed their liberty to degenerate into licence (Gal. v. 13); who, from an altogether superficial view of grace, thought lightly of continuing in sin (Rom. vi. 1, 12-13, 15, 23); who, while bearing the name of Christ, were concerned only with their own self-indulgence (Rom. xvi. 18). If there did exist at Philippi any section disposed to look with favour on Judaising tendencies, this might lead others to exaggerate the opposite way of thinking and to become a ready prey to Antinomian reaction. Possibly passages like the present and Rom. xvi. 18 point to the earliest beginnings of that strange medley of doctrines which afterwards developed into Gnosticism. That this is the more natural explanation seems also to follow from the context. The Apostle has had in view, from ver. 11 onwards, the advance towards perfection, the point already attained, the kind of course to be imitated. It seems most fitting that he should warn against those who pretended to be on the straight path, but who were really straying on devious by-ways of their own.—**οὓς πολλάκις ἔλεγον κ.τ.λ.** "Whom I often used to call," etc. (so also Grotius, Heinrichs, Hfm.). *Cf.* Æsch., *Eumen.*, 48, **οὔτοι γυναῖκας ἀλλὰ Γοργόνας λέγω.** Hatz. (*Einl.*, p. 223) remarks that in the Greek islands they say **μὲ λέγει** or **λέγει με** = "he names me". Paul speaks with a depth and vehemence of feeling (**πολλοὶ . . . πολλάκις . . . κλαίων**) which suggest his genuine interest in those disloyal Christians who had once seemed to receive his message. If we imagine that the terms he uses are too strong to apply to professing Christians, we must remember that he speaks in a most solemn mood and from the highest point of view.—**τ. ἐχθροὺς τ. στ. τ. Χ.** If we are right in taking **λέγω** = "call," "name," **τοὺς ἐχθ.** will come in as the remoter accusative. Otherwise it must be regarded as assimilated to the relative clause, as in 1 John ii. 25. The true Christian is the man who is "crucified with Christ," who has "crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts". The Cross is the central principle in his life. "If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow Me." Those here described, by their unthinking self-indulgence, run directly in the teeth of this principle. The same thing holds good of much that passes for Christianity in modern life. "Who has not known kindly, serviceable men hanging about the Churches with a real predilection for the suburban life of Zion . . . and yet men whose life just seemed to omit the Cross of Christ" (Rainy, *op. cit.*, p. 286). It is quite probable that Paul would feel their conduct all the more keenly inasmuch as Judaisers might point to it as the logical consequence of his liberal principles.

Ver. 19. **ἀπώλεια.** Paul regards the two issues of human life as **σωτηρία** and **ἀπώλεια** (1 Cor. i. 18, 2 Cor. ii. 15-16). The latter is a common word for "destruction". There is much in the Epistles to support the statement of Hltzm. (*N.T. Th.*, ii., p. 50): "To be dead and to remain dead eternally, that is to him (Paul) the most dreadful of all thoughts". (Similarly Kabisch, *Eschatol. d. Paul.*, pp. 85,

k Jas. iii. 15. k ἐπίγεια φρονοῦντες. 20. ἡμῶν γὰρ [1] τὸ [l] πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανοῖς
l Only here in N.T.
ὑπάρχει, ἐξ οὗ καὶ [m] σωτῆρα [n] ἀπεκδεχόμεθα, Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν·
m P. has it Eph. v. 23.
Past. Epp. (ten times). A word found (with excep. of four exx. in Luke's writings) only in later books of N.T. n 1 Cor. i. 7; Gal. v. 5; Heb. ix. 28.

[1] δε d, e, f, g, m, go. arm. æth. syrsch. et p. mg., Clem., Or., Eus., Chr., Thdrt., Cyp., Hil.

134.)—**ἡ κοιλία.** Most comm. compare Eupolis, **Κολακ. 4, κοιλιοδαίμων,** a "devotee of the belly". **κ.** is probably used as a general term to include all that belongs most essentially to the bodily, fleshly life of man and therefore inevitably perishes. *Istorum venter nitet: nostrum corpus atteritur: utrumque schema commutabitur* (Beng.). Hort (*Judaistic Christianity*, p. 115 ff.) supposes that we have here the same development of Judaism which is attacked in Col. ii. 20-23. But this type of life was by no means confined to Jews.—**ἡ δ. ἐν τ. αἰσχ.** "Who boast of what is really a disgrace to them." Wetst. aptly quotes Polyb., 15, 23, **ἐφ' οἷς ἐχρῆν αἰσχύνεσθαι καθ' ὑπερβολήν, ἐπὶ τούτοις ὡς καλοῖς σεμνύνεσθαι καὶ μεγαλαυχεῖν.** *Cf.* Prov. xxvi. 11, **ἔστιν αἰσχύνη ἐπάγουσα ἁμαρτίαν, καὶ ἔστιν αἰσχύνη δόξα καὶ χάρις.** (So also Sirach iv. 21.) This was apparently a current proverb. The limiting of **αἰσχ.** here to sensual sins is doubtful.—**οἱ τ. ἐπίγ. φρον.** It seems reasonable to explain the nominative as a resumption of the opening words of the sentence, summing up tersely the character in view. *Cf.* Mark xii. 38-40. **τὰ ἐπίγ.** are opposed to **τὰ ἔμπροσθεν** or **τὰ ἄνω.** Curiously parallel is the Homeric phrase (*Odyss.*, 21, 85), **νήπιοι ἀγροιῶται ἐφημέρια φρονέοντες.**

Vv. 20-21. HEAVENLY-MINDEDNESS AND ITS PROSPECT.—Ver. 20. **τὸ πολίτευμα.** "Our commonwealth." (Tertull., *municipatus*. Cyp., Iren., *conversatio*.) The thought is certainly suggested by **ἐπίγ. φρον.** in ver. 19 (this is the force of **γάρ**). This world has a characteristic spirit of its own. Worldliness is the common bond of citizenship in it. There is another commonwealth, not of the world (John xviii. 36), which inspires its members with a different tone of life. They "seek the things above where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God". *Cf.* 4 *Ezr.*, 8, 52: *Vobis enim apertus est paradisus . . . praeparata est habundantia, aedificata est civitas.* The stability and security of the *pax Romana* (one of the most favourable influences for Christianity) filled the thought of the time with high conceptions of citizenship and its value. This would specially appeal to the Philippians, who must have prided themselves on possessing the *jus Italicum* with all its privileges (see Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, Bd. i., pp. 363-365). Again and again Paul himself found his Roman citizenship a sure protection. Perhaps the unjust treatment he had received in that capacity at Philippi (Acts xvi. 22-23, 37-39) resulted in securing for the young Christian community a certain immunity from persecution through the favour of the magistrates who might fear the consequences of their gross violation of justice. The word **πολίτευμα** had been adopted by the Jews from Greek civic life long before this letter was written (see Hicks, *Classical Review*, i., 1, pp. 6-7, on the whole subject of political terms in N.T.). *Cf.* Philo, *de Conf. Ling.*, p. 78 (ed. Wendl.), **πατρίδα μὲν τὸν οὐράνιον χῶρον ἐν ᾧ πολιτεύονται, ξένην δὲ τὸν περίγειον ἐν ᾧ παρῴκησαν νομίζουσαι**; Aug., *de Civ. D.*, xi., 1 (quoted by Wohl.); the Latin Mediaev. Hymn, *Urbs Ierusalem beata, Dicta pacis visio, Quae construitur in caelis, Vivis ex lapidibus*; and see Heb. x. 34, Jas. iv. 4, 1 John ii. 17. **πολίτ.** is used = "commonwealth" in 2 Macc. xii. 7 and Inscriptions. There is a good discussion of Paul's relation to the state in Hltzm., *N.T. Th.*, ii., p. 157 ff.—**ἐν οὐρανοῖς.** Paul had no earthly home.—**ὑπάρχει.** It is perhaps used to add dignity to the thought, or, possibly, to emphasise the idea of substantial existence and reality. *Cf.* **ὑπάρχων** in chap. ii. 6.—**ἐξ οὗ.** It seems needless to make this an adverb. **οὗ** refers quite directly to **πολίτευμα** (so also Beng., Hfm., Lips., Holst., etc.).—**καί** marks the reasonableness of looking for the Saviour from the heavenly commonwealth. Because their **πολίτ.** is in heaven they have a claim on the Saviour, just as the Philippians might rightfully look for protection to Rome.—**σωτῆρα.** Used, no doubt, in the technical sense of Christ's deliverance at His coming (so

21. ὃς [o]μετασχηματίσει τὸ σῶμα τῆς [p]ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν, εἰς[1] τὸ γενέσθαι αὐτὸ[1] [q]σύμμορφον[2] τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, κατὰ τὴν [r]ἐνέργειαν τοῦ δύνασθαι αὐτὸν καὶ ὑποτάξαι ἑαυτῷ[3] τὰ πάντα.

o 1 Cor. iv. 6; 2 Cor. xi. 13-15. No other exx. in N.T. Late authors.

p Luke i. 48 (1 Sam. i. 11); Acts viii. 33 (Isa. liii. 8). q For constrn. see note *infr.* Rom. viii. 29. r Eph. iii. 7; Col. ii. 12 *al* (only in P). Four exx. in Wisd.

[1] So Db et c, EKLP, Chr., Thdrt., Victorin., Aug. ("an ancient supplement," Myr.). Edd. om. **εις το γενεσθαι αυτο** with ℵABD*FG, d, e, f, g, m, vg. go. cop., many Fathers.

[2] So Trg., Alf., Ws., W.H. with ABDcEKLP, etc. Ti. **συνμ.** with ℵD*FG.

[3] So ℵcDcEL, vg., Chr.^{341}, Thdrt., Dam., Hil. Ti., Trg., Alf., Myr., Ws. **αυτω** (W.H. **αὐτῷ**) with ℵ*ABD*FGKP, d, e, g, Eus., Epiph., Euth., Chr.

also Kl.), but strangely rare until the Pastoral Epistles. It corresponds to Paul's use of **σωτηρία.**—**ἀπεκδεχ.** The compound emphasises the intense yearning for the Parousia. It is no wonder that early Christian thought centred round that time. There was nothing to root their affections in the world (*cf.* Gal. i. 4). The dominant influence of this expectation in Paul's thinking and working is only beginning to be fully recognised. See some suggestive paragraphs in Wernle's *Der Christ u. die Sünde bei Paul.*, pp. 122-123.—**Κύρ. Ἰ. Χ.** This order is always found in the phrase.

Ver. 21. **μετασχ.** It is doubtful whether, in this passage, any special force can be given to **μετασχ.** as distinguished from **μεταμορφοῦν**, carrying out the difference between **σχῆμα** and **μορφή.** The doubt is borne out by its close connexion here with **σύμμορφον.** Perhaps, however, the compound of **σχῆμα** has in view the fact that only the fashion or figure in which the personality is clothed will be transformed. We have here (as Gw. notes) the reverse of the process in chap. ii. 6-11. The *locus classicus* on the word is 2 Cor. xi. 13-15. It is found in Plato and Aristotle in its strict sense. *Cf.* also 4 Macc., ix., 22. It is Christ who effects the transformation in the case of His followers, because He is **πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν** (1 Cor. xv. 45). *Cf. Apocal. of Bar.*, li. 3: "As for the glory of those who have now been justified in my law . . . their splendour will be glorified in changes, and the form of their face will be turned into the light of their beauty, that they may be able to acquire and receive the world which does not die".—**τὸ σῶμα τ. ταπειν.** The expression must apply esp. to the unfitness of the present bodily nature to fulfil the claims of the spiritual life. It is pervaded by fleshly lusts; it is doomed to decay. **ταπειν.** is plainly suggested by **δόξα** which follows. **σῶμα** is "pure form which may have the most diverse content. Here, on earth, **σῶμα** = **σάρξ**" (see an illuminating discussion by F. Köstlin, *Jahrb. f. deutsche Th.*, 1877, p. 279 ff.). Holst. (*Paulin. Th.*, p. 10) notes that for this conception of **σῶμα** as "organised matter," the older Judaism had no word besides בְּשָׂר. Later Hellenistic Judaism used the word **σῶμα** in its Pauline sense (see Wisd. ix. 15).—**εἰς τὸ γ. α.** is to be omitted with the best authorities. See crit. note *supr.*—**σύμμορφον** is used proleptically as its position shows. *Cf.* 1 Thess. iii. 13, **στηρίξαι τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν ἀμέμπτους.** Perhaps the compound of **μορφή** is used to remind them of the completeness of their future assimilation to Christ. *Cf.* Rom. viii. 29. The end of the enumeration in that passage is **ἐδόξασεν.** **δόξα** is the climax here.—**τ. σώμ. τ. δόξης α.** With Paul **δόξα** is always the outward expression of the spiritual life (**πνεῦμα**). It is, if one may so speak, the semblance of the Divine life in heaven. The Divine **πνεῦμα** will ultimately reveal itself in all who have received it as **δόξα.** That is what the N.T. writers mean by the completed, perfected "likeness to Christ". This passage, combined with 1 Cor. xv. 35-50 and 2 Cor. iv. 16-v. 5, gives us the deepest insight we have into Paul's idea of the transition from the present life to the future. He only speaks in detail of that which awaits believers. Whether they die before the Parousia or survive till then, a change will take place in them. But this is not arbitrary. It is illustrated by the sowing of seed. The Divine **πνεῦμα** which they have received will work out for them a **σῶμα πνευματικόν.** Their renewed nature will be clothed with a corresponding body through the power of Christ who is Himself the source of their

IV. 1. Ὥστε, ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοὶ καὶ [a] ἐπιπόθητοι, χαρὰ καὶ [b] στέφανός μου,[1] οὕτω[2c] στήκετε ἐν Κυρίῳ, ἀγαπητοί.[3]

2. Εὐοδίαν[4] [d] παρακαλῶ, καὶ Συντύχην[5] παρακαλῶ, τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν

a Only here in N.T. Apost. Fathers.

b See note *infr.*, and *cf.* Prov. xii. 4, xvi. 31, xvii. 6 *al.*

c See on chap. i. 27 *supr.*

d Acts xi. 23, xiv. 22; 1 Thess. iv. 10 *al.*

[1] Om. B*.

[2] So BD*. Edd. ουτως with ℵADcEFGLP.

[3] B 17, cop. syrsch. add μου. D*, 108*, d, e, go., Victorin. om. αγαπητοι.

[4] Alf. Ευωδιαν with P 47, *al.*

[5] So Lach., Trg., Ws., W.H. Ti. Συντυχήν with Dc.

spiritual life. The σῶμα σαρκικόν must perish: that is the fate of σάρξ. If there be no πνεῦμα, and thus no σῶμα πνευματικόν, the end is destruction. But the σῶμα πνευματικόν is precisely that in which Christ rose from the dead and in which He now lives. Its outward semblance is δόξα, a glory which shone forth upon Paul from the risen Christ on the Damascus road, which he could never forget. Hence all in whom Christ has operated as πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν will be "changed into the same likeness from glory (δόξα) to glory". Paul does not here reflect on the time when the transformation takes place. That is of little moment to him. The fact is his supreme consolation. On the whole discussion see esp. Hltzm., *N.T. Th.*, ii., pp. 80-81 and Heinrici on 1 Cor. xv. 35 ff.; for the future δόξα *cf. Apocal. of Bar.*, xv. 8 (Ed. Charles).—κατὰ τ. ἐνέργ. ἐνέργεια is only used of superhuman power in N.T. *Quia nihil magis incredibile, nec magis a sensu carnis dissentaneum quam resurrectio: hac de causa Paulus infinitam Dei potentiam nobis ponit ob oculos quae omnem dubitationem absorbeat. Nam inde nascitur diffidentia quod rem ipsam metimur ingenii nostri angustiis* (Calvin). —τοῦ δύν. "His efficiency which consists in His being able," etc. The beginnings of this use of the genitive of the infinitive without a preposition appear in classical Greek. But in N.T. it was extended like that of ἵνα. *Cf.*, *e.g.*, Acts xiv. 9, 2 Cor. viii. 11. See Blass, *Gram.*, p. 229; Viteau, *Le Verbe*, p. 170.—ὑποτάξαι. *Cf.* 1 Cor. i. 24-28. — ἑαυτῷ. αυτω must be read with the best authorities. How is it to be accented? Is it to be αὐτῷ or αὐτῷ? W.H. read the former, regarding this as one of the exceptional cases where "a refusal to admit the rough breathing introduces language completely at variance with all Greek usage without the constraint of any direct evidence, and solely on the strength of partial analogies" (*N.T.*, ii., *Append.*, p. 144). On the other hand, Blass (*Gram.*, p. 35, note 2) refuses to admit αὑτῷ. Winer, although preferring αὐτῷ, leaves the matter to the judgment of edd. Buttmann gives good reasons for usually reading αὐτ. (*Gram.*, p. 111). Certainly αὑτοῦ is quite common as a reflexive in Inscriptions of the Imperial age (see Meisterhans, *Gram. d. Att. Inschrr.*, § 59, 5). To sum up, it cannot be said that the aspirated form is impossible, but ordinarily it is safer to omit the aspirate. *Cf.* Simcox, *Lang. of N.T.*, pp. 63-64.

Chapter IV.—Vv. 1-3. Counsels to individual members of the Church. —Ver. 1. ὥστε. It seems better to regard this as drawing the conclusion from iii. 17-21 than to refer it to the whole of the discussion in chap. iii.—στέφ. μ. *Cf.* the combination in 1 Thess. ii. 19, τίς γὰρ ἡμῶν ἐλπὶς ἢ χαρὰ ἢ στέφανος καυχήσεως; the meaning is best seen from chap. ii. 16. He is thinking of the "day of Christ". His loyal Christian converts will then be his garland of victory, the clear proof that he has not run in vain. *Cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 24-25, Sirach vi. 31. στεφανόω often means "to reward," see Dsm., *BS.*, p. 261.—οὕτω. That is, according to the type which has been described in chap. iii. 17 ff.—στήκετε is a word of late coinage, belonging to the colloquial language, and leaving as its survival the modern Greek στέκω. Often found in N.T.

Ver. 2. Εὐοδ. κ.τ.λ. This direct reference to a difference of opinion between two women of prominence in the Philippian Church is probably the best comment we have on the slight dissensions which are here and there hinted at throughout the Epistle. For, as Schinz aptly puts it (*op. cit.*, p. 37), "in such a pure Church, even slight bickerings would make a great impression". We find no trace of the cause. It may have turned on the question discussed in chap. iii.

ἐν Κυρίῳ. 3. καὶ[1] [e]ἐρωτῶ καὶ σέ, σύζυγε[2] [f]γνήσιε,[3] [g]συλλαμβάνου[4] αὐταῖς, αἵτινες ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ [h]συνήθλησάν μοι, μετὰ καὶ[5] Κλήμεντος, καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν[6] συνεργῶν μου, ὧν τὰ ὀνόματα ἐν [i]βίβλῳ ζωῆς.

e See note *infr.* f 1 Tim. i. 2; Tit. i. 4. g Luke v. 7 (no other ex. in N.T.). h Chap. i. 27. i See note *infr.*

[1] So 115, Ambrst. Edd. **ναι** with ℵABDEFGKLP, O.L. vg., etc.

[2] So ℵ*BDᶜEKLP. Ti., Alf., Ws., W.H. (ʳ ᵀ) **συνζυγε** with ℵᶜAD*FG (see Bousset, *Textkrit. Studien*, p. 102). W.H. mg. **Συνζυγε.**

[3] So KL, syrr., Chr., Thdrt. Edd. **γν. σ.** with ℵABDE(FG)P 17, 47, etc.

[4] So Lach. with ABᶜDᶜEKLP. Edd. **συνλ.** with ℵB*D*FG 17 (see Ws., *TK.*, p. 138; Bousset, *op. cit.*, p. 103).

[5] Om. **και** D*EFG, d, e, f, g, vg. go. syrp. arm. æth., Vict., Ambrst.

[6] ℵ* **και των λοιπων** after **μου.**

15-16. It may have been accidental friction between two energetic Christian women. But from the whole tone of the Epistle it cannot have gone far. Six Christian bishops named **Εὐόδιος** are mentioned in the *Dict. of Christ. Biogr.* The feminine name is also found in Inscrr.—**Συντύχη.** The name occurs both in Greek and Latin Inscrr., as well as in the *Acta Sanctorum* (v., 225). Curiously enough, there is no masculine name precisely corresponding to be found except the form *Sintichus* (*C.I.L.*, xii., no. 4703, from Narbo in Gaul. The Inscr. quoted by Lft. is spurious). On the correct accentuation see the elaborate note in W-Sch., p. 71. Lft. has collected valuable evidence to show the superior position occupied by women in Macedonia. See his *Philippians*, p. 56, notes 2, 3, where he quotes Inscrr., in some of which a metronymic takes the place of the patronymic, while others record monuments erected in honour of women by public bodies. We may add, from Heuzey, *Voyage Archéol.*, p. 423, an Inscr. of Larissa, where a woman's name occurs among the winners in the horse-races (see *Introduction*). For the prominence of women generally in the Pauline Churches, *cf.* Rom. xvi. *passim*, 1 Cor. xiv. 34-35. The repetition of **παρακαλῶ** perhaps hints that Paul wishes to treat each of them alike. [Hitzig, *Zur Kritik Paulin. Brr.*, p. 5 ff., exemplifies the pitch of absurdity which N.T. critics reached in a former generation, by supposing that these names represent two heathen-Christian parties, the one Greek, the other Roman.]

Ver. 3. **ναί** must certainly be read with all trustworthy authorities. Exactly parallel is Philm. 20. *Cf.* Soph., *Elect.*, 1445, **σὲ κρίνω, ναὶ σέ.**—**ἐρωτῶ** is common in N.T. = "beseech," *e.g.*, Luke xiv. 18. It is not so found in LXX, and this sense is very rare in late writers.—**γνήσιε σ.** is to be read with the great mass of authorities. We believe that W.H. are right in their marginal reading of **Σύνζυγε** as a proper name. This would harmonise with the other names mentioned. And the epithet **γν.** increases the probability. He requests Syzygus (lit. = joiner together) to help Euodia and Syntyche to make up their differences. "I beseech thee, who art a genuine Syzygus (in deed as well as in name) to help," etc. (so also Myr., Kl., Weizs.). See esp. an excellent discussion by Laurent, *N.T. Studien*, pp. 134-137. The fact that this name has not been found in books, Inscrr., etc., is no argument against its existence. Zygos is found as a Jewish name (quoted by Zunz). Similar compounds such as **Συμφέρων, Συμφέρουσα** occur. Perhaps all the above names were given to them after Baptism. Lft. and others refer **σύνζ.** to Epaphroditus. Chr. thinks of the husband of one of the women addressed. Wieseler (*Chronol.*, p. 458) actually refers it to Christ.—**συλλ.** Paul's friend is plainly a man of tact who can do much to bring the Christian women now at variance together again. Holst. thinks, and perhaps with some reason, that the use of **συλλαμβ.** implies that Euodia and Syntyche were already trying to lay aside their differences.—**αἵτινες.** "Inasmuch as they laboured with me." Their former services to the Gospel are a reason why they should receive every encouragement to a better state of mind. *Cf.* Acts xvi. 13.—**μετὰ καὶ Κλ.** An unusual position for **καί** although found in Pindar, Dionys.

k 1 Tim. iii. 3; Tit. iii. 2; Jas. iii. 17; 1 Pet. ii. 18.

4. Χαίρετε ἐν Κυρίῳ πάντοτε· πάλιν ἐρῶ, χαίρετε. 5. τὸ [k]ἐπιεικὲς ὑμῶν γνωσθήτω πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις. ὁ Κύριος ἐγγύς.

Halicarn., Aelian, and, above all, in Josephus, who delights in this construction (see Schmidt, *De Elocut. Jos.*, p. 16; Schmid, *Atticismus*, iii., p. 337). These words must be taken with **συνήθλ.** He wishes to remind his Christian friend at Philippi of the noble company to which the women had belonged, a company held in the highest esteem in the Philippian Church. **Κλήμης** must have been some disciple at Philippi, unknown to Church history like the others mentioned here. It is nothing short of absurd (with Gw.) to make this Clement the celebrated bishop of Rome. See esp. Salmon, *Dict. of Chr. Biog.*, i., p. 555. The same form in **-ης, -εντος** is seen in **Κρήσκης, Πούδης** (2 Tim. iv. 10, 21).—**ὧν τὰ ὀν. ἐν βίβ. ζ.** Perhaps the phrase implies that they had passed away. The Apostle almost seems to foresee the obscurity which will hang over many a devoted fellow-labourer of his. But their names have a glory greater than that of historical renown. They are in the **βίβλος ζωῆς.** The idea is common in O.T. *Cf.* Exod. xxxii. 32, Ps. lxix. 29, Dan. xii. 1. See also *Apocal. of Bar.*, xxiv., 1; *Henoch*, xlvii., 3; 4 *Ezra* xiv., 35; and, in N.T., Rev. iii. 5. Good discussions of the subject will be found in Weber, *Lehren d. Talmud*, pp. 233, 276; Schürer, ii., 2, p. 182.

Vv. 4-9. GENERAL EXHORTATIONS ON THE RIGHT SPIRIT AND THE RIGHT CONDUCT OF LIFE.—Ver. 4. **χαίρετε** expresses the predominant mood of the Epistle, a mood wonderfully characteristic of Paul's closing years.—**πάλιν.** "He doubles it to take away the scruple of those that might say, what, shall we rejoice in afflictions?" (G. Herbert).—**ἐρῶ.** The future of this verb is probably used here, as apparently often in late Greek, for the present.

Ver. 5. **τ. ἐπιεικ.** "Reasonableness." Matthew Arnold finds in this a pre-eminent feature in the character of Jesus and designates it "sweet reasonableness" (see *Literature and Dogma*, pp. 66, 138). The trait could not be more vividly delineated than in the words of W. Pater (*Marius the Epicurean*, ii., p. 120), describing the spirit of the new Christian society as it appeared to a pagan. "As if by way of a due recognition of some immeasurable Divine condescension manifest in a certain historic fact, its influence was felt more especially at those points which demanded some sacrifice of one's self, for the weak, for the aged, for little children, and even for the dead. And then, for its constant outward token, its significant manner or index, it issued in a certain debonair grace, and a certain mystic attractiveness, a courtesy, which made Marius doubt whether that famed Greek blitheness or gaiety or grace in the handling of life had been, after all, an unrivalled success." A definition is given by Aristot., *Eth. Nic.*, 5, 10, 3, **τὸ ἐπιεικὲς δίκαιον μέν ἐστιν, οὐ τὸ κατὰ νόμον δέ, ἀλλ' ἐπανόρθωμα νομίμου δικαίου,** where the point is that it means a yielding up of certain real rights. This spirit, in the Christian life, is due to those higher claims of love which Christ has set in the forefront. *Cf.* 2 Cor. x. 1, Tit. iii. 2. Their joy (ver. 4) really depends on this "reasonableness" having as wide a scope as possible. It is he who shows forbearance and graciousness all round (**γνωσθ. πᾶσιν ἀνθ.**) who can preserve an undisturbed heart. In Ps. Sol. v. 14 God is called **χρηστὸς καὶ ἐπιεικής.**—**ὁ κ. ἐγγύς.** Quite evidently Paul expects a speedy return of Christ. It was natural in the beginning of the Church's history, before men had a large enough perspective in which to discern the tardy processes of the Kingdom of God. *Cf.* chap. iii. 21. This solemn fact which governs the whole of Paul's thinking, and has especially moulded his ethical teaching, readily suggests "reasonableness". The Lord, the Judge, is at the door. Leave all wrongs for Him to adjust. Forbear all wrath and retaliation (*cf.* Rom. xii. 19 ff.). But further, in view of such a prospect, earthly bickerings and wranglings are utterly trivial. *Cf.* 1 John ii. 28, "Abide in Him, so that if He be manifested, we may have boldness and not be ashamed before Him at His coming." A close parallel is Jas. v. 8.

Ver. 6. **μ. μερ.** "In nothing be anxious." **μερ.** is not common in earlier prose. It is used repeatedly in LXX of anxiety (*a*) approaching dread as Ps. xxxvii. 19, (*b*) producing displeasure as Ezek. xvi. 42, (*c*) of a general kind as 1 Chron. xvii. 9. For the thought *cf.* 4 *Ezra* ii. 27: *Noli satagere, cum venerit enim dies pressurae et angustiae . . . tu autem hilaris et copiosa eris.* See the

6. μηδὲν [l] μεριμνᾶτε, ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ τῇ δεήσει μετὰ [m] εὐχαριστίας τὰ [m] αἰτήματα ὑμῶν [n] γνωριζέσθω πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. 7. καὶ ἡ [o] εἰρήνη τοῦ Θεοῦ,[1] ἡ ὑπερέχουσα πάντα [p] νοῦν, [p] φρουρήσει τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν καὶ τὰ [p] νοήματα [2] ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ [3] Ἰησοῦ.

l Matt. vi. 25, 27, 31; Luke xii. 22, 25, 26 *al.*
m See note *infr.*
n Frequent in N.T.
o *Cf.* Col. iii. 15.
p See note *infr.*

[1] του Χριστου A, syrp. mg., Cyr., Proc., Ambr., Pelag.

[2] σωματα Fgr.G, d, e, g, m, Victorin., Chrom.

note on chap. ii. 20 *supr.*—**προσευ. κ. τ. δεήσ. προσευχή** emphasises prayer as an act of worship or devotion; **δεήσις** is the cry of personal need. See on chap. i. 4 *supr. Curare et orare plus inter se pugnant quam aqua et ignis* (Beng.).—**μετὰ εὐχ.** The word is rarely found in secular Greek (*e.g.*, Hippocr., Polyb., Diod.; see Rutherford, *New Phrynichus*, p. 69), or LXX. Paul uses it twelve times, but only twice with the article. Does not this imply that he takes for granted that thanksgiving is the background, the predominant tone of the Christian life? To pray in any other spirit is to clip the wings of prayer.—**αἴτημα** is found three times in N.T. It emphasises the object asked for (see an important discussion by Ezra Abbot in *N. Amer. Review*, 1872, p. 171 ff.). "Prayer is a wish referred to God, and the possibility of such reference, save in matters of mere indifference, is the test of the purity of the wish" (Green, *Two Sermons*, p. 44).—**πρὸς τ. Θεόν.** "In the presence of God." A delicate and suggestive way of hinting that God's presence is always there, that it is the atmosphere surrounding them. Anxious foreboding is out of place in a Father's presence. Requests are always in place with Him. With this phrase *cf.* Rom. xvi. 26.

Ver. 7. Hpt. would put no stop at the close of ver. 6. Whether there be a stop or not, this verse is manifestly a kind of apodosis to the preceding. "If you make your requests, etc., . . . then the peace . . . shall guard," etc. **ἡ εἰρ. τ. Θ.** Paul's favourite thought of that health and harmonious relation which prevail in the inner life as the result of reconciliation with God through Jesus Christ. *Cf.* Matt. xi. 28. It would be an undue restriction of his thought to imagine that he only refers to agreement between members of the Church, although, no doubt, that idea is here included. "This peace is like some magic mirror, by the dimness growing on which we may discern the breath of an unclean spirit that would work us ill" (Rendel Harris, *Memoranda Sacra*, p. 130; the quotation skilfully catches the spiritual conception before Paul's mind). To share anxiety with God is to destroy its corroding power and to be calmed by His peace. Peace is used as a name of God in the Talmud (see Taylor, *Jewish Fathers*, pp. 25-26).—**ἡ ὑπερέχ. πάντα νοῦν.** "Which surpasses every thought, all our conception." (So also Chr., Erasm., Weizs., Moule, Von Soden, etc.). This meaning seems inevitable from the parallel in Eph. iii. 20, **τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑπὲρ πάντα ποιῆσαι ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ ὧν αἰτούμεθα ἢ νοοῦμεν,** and *cf.* ver. 19, **τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνώσεως ἀγάπην τοῦ Χ.** Space forbids the enumeration of the many interpretations given. Wordsworth (*Prelude*, Bk. 14) defines this peace as "repose in moral judgments".—**νοῦν . . . καρδίας . . . νοήματα. νοῦς,** very much what we call "reason," in Paul's view, belongs to the life of the **σάρξ.** It is the highest power in that life, and affords, as it were, the material on which the Divine **πνεῦμα** can work. It remains in those who possess the **πνεῦμα** as that part of the inner man which is exposed to earthly influences and relations. (See an admirable note in Ws.) **καρδία** is "a more undefined concept, side by side with **νοῦς**" (so Lüdemann, *Anthropol.*, p. 16 ff.). It has to do not merely with feelings but with will. **νοήματα** are products of the **νοῦς,** thoughts or purposes. Paul would probably regard them as being contained in the **καρδία.** The word is found five times in 2 Cor. and nowhere else in N.T.—**φρουρήσει.** A close parallel is 1 Peter i. 5, **τοὺς ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ φρουρουμένους διὰ πίστεως εἰς σωτηρίαν.** Hicks (*Class. Review*, i., pp. 7-8) presses the figure of a garrison keeping ward over a town, and observes that one of the most important elements in the history of the Hellenistic period was the garrisoning of the cities both in Greece and Asia Minor by the successors of Alexander the Great.

8. Τὸ λοιπόν, ἀδελφοί, ὅσα ἐστὶν ἀληθῆ, ὅσα [q] σεμνά, ὅσα δίκαια, ὅσα [r] ἁγνά, ὅσα [s] προσφιλῆ, ὅσα [t] εὔφημα, εἴ[1] τις ἀρετὴ καὶ εἴ τις [u] ἔπαινος,[2] ταῦτα [v] λογίζεσθε. 9. ἃ καὶ ἐμάθετε καὶ παρελάβετε καὶ ἠκούσατε καὶ εἴδετε ἐν ἐμοί, ταῦτα πράσσετε· καὶ ὁ Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης ἔσται μεθ' ὑμῶν.

q 1 Tim. iii. 8, 11; Tit. ii. 2 (of persons).
r 2 Cor. vii. 11; 1 Tim. v. 22; Jas. iii. 17; 1 Pet. iii. 2.
s Only here in N.T. Sirach.
t Only here in N.T.
u *Cf.* chap. i. 11; Eph. i. 6, 12, 14.
v See on chap. iii. 13.

[1] η K 17, d. scr. [2] επιστημης added by D*E*FG, d, e, f, g, Ambrst.

Cf. Gal. iii. 23. The peace of God is the garrison of the soul in all the experiences of its life, defending it from the external assaults of temptation or anxiety, and disciplining all lawless desires and imaginations within, that war against its higher purposes.—**ἐν Χ. Ἰ.** Christ Jesus is the sure refuge and the atmosphere of security.

Ver. 8. The thought of this paragraph (vv. 8-9) is closely connected with that of the preceding by the resumption of the phrase **ἡ εἰρήνη τ. Θ.** (ver. 7) in a new form **ὁ Θ. τῆς εἰρήνης** (ver. 9). The peace of God will be the guardian of their thoughts and imaginations, only they must do their part in bending their minds to worthy objects. Lft. and Ws. have elaborate classifications of Paul's list of moral excellences. It is not probable, in the circumstances, that any such was before the Apostle's mind.—**τὸ λοιπόν** is probably used to show that he is hastening to a close. See on chap. iii. 1 *supr.* Beyschl. well remarks on the "inexhaustibility" of the Christian moral ideal which is here presented. It embraces practically all that was of value in ancient ethics.—**ἀληθῆ** and **δίκαια** express the very foundations of moral life. If truth and righteousness are lacking, there is nothing to hold moral qualities together. —**σεμνά.** "Reverend." The due appreciation of such things produces what M. Arnold would call "a noble seriousness" (so also Vinc.). — **προσφιλῆ.** Our "lovely" in its original force gives the exact meaning, "those things whose grace attracts". The idea seems to be esp. applied to personal *bearing* towards others. See Sirach iv. 7, **προσφιλῆ συναγωγῇ σεαυτὸν ποιεῖ**; xx. 13, **ὁ σοφὸς ἐν λόγῳ ἑαυτὸν προσφιλῆ ποιήσει.** *Cf.* W. Pater's description of the Church in the second century: "She had set up for herself the ideal of spiritual development under the guidance of an instinct by which, in those serious moments, she was absolutely true to the peaceful soul of her Founder. 'Goodwill to men,' she said, 'in whom God Himself is well-pleased.' For a little while at least there was no forced opposition between the soul and the body, the world and the spirit, and the grace of graciousness itself was pre-eminently with the people of Christ" (*Marius*, ii., p. 132).—**εὔφημα.** Exactly = our "high-toned". (So also Ell.) "Was einen guten Klang hat" (Lips.). It is an extremely rare word.—**εἴ τ. ἀρετ. κ.τ.λ.** "Whatever excellence there be or fit object of praise." The suggestion of Lft., "Whatever value may exist in (heathen) virtue," etc., goes slightly beyond the natural sense, from the reader's point of view. *Cf. Sayings of Jew. Fathers*, chap. ii., 1, "Rabbi said, which is the right course that a man should choose for himself? Whatsoever is a pride to him that pursues it and brings him honour from men." On the important range of meanings belonging to **ἀρετή**, see Dsm., *BS.*, p. 90 ff.—**ἔπαινος**, as Hort (on 1 Pet. i. 7) points out, corresponds exactly to **ἀρετή** and implies it, including in itself the idea of *moral* approbation. He observes that it refers chiefly to "the inward disposition to acts as actions" (see the whole valuable note).—**τ. λογίζ.** "Make them the subject of careful reflection." *Meditatio . . . praecedit: deinde sequitur opus* (Calv.).

Ver. 9. It is hardly possible, with Ell., to refer **ἃ καὶ κ.τ.λ.** immediately to the preceding, without forcing the construction.—**ἐμάθ. κ. παρελ.** plainly refer to the definite Christian teaching he had set himself to give them. **παραλαμβάνω** is used regularly of "receiving" truth from a teacher.—**ἠκ. κ. εἶδ. ἐν ἐ.** This is the impression made upon them by his Christian character, apart from any conscious effort on his part. *Cf.* chap. iii. 17.—**ὁ Θ. τ. εἰρ.** See on ver. 8 (*ad init.*). It is quite possible that he has partly in view the disregard of these ethical qualities as threatening the harmony of the Church, and as, so far, to blame for the divisions already existing.

10. Ἐχάρην δὲ ἐν Κυρίῳ μεγάλως, ὅτι ἤδη ποτὲ [w] ἀνεθάλετε [1] τὸ [2] ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ φρονεῖν· ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ ἐφρονεῖτε, [x] ἠκαιρεῖσθε δέ. 11. οὐχ ὅτι καθ' [y] ὑστέρησιν λέγω· ἐγὼ γὰρ ἔμαθον, ἐν οἷς εἰμί, [z] αὐτάρκης

w Only here in N.T. Ezek. xvii. 24; Sirach i. 18, xi. 22, l. 10 *al.*

See note *infr.* x Only here. y Mark xii. 44. z *Cf.* 2 Cor. ix. 8; 1 Tim. vi. 6.

[1] D* εθαλατε. P 1, 4, 43 ανεθαλλετε. [2] FG του.

Vv. 10-14. DELICATE EXPRESSION OF THANKS FOR THEIR GIFT.—Ver. 10. **δέ** marks the turning of Paul's thoughts to a different subject, or, as Lft. admirably expresses it, "arrests a subject which is in danger of escaping". He has not, up till now, *expressly* thanked them for their generous gift which was, in all likelihood, the occasion of this letter. The very fact of his accepting a present from them showed his confidence in their affection. This was indeed his right, but he seldom laid claim to it. No doubt the delicacy of his language here is due (so also Hilgenfeld, *ZwTh.*, xx., 2, pp. 183-184) to the base slanders uttered against him at Corinth and in Macedonia (1 Thess. ii. 5), as making the Gospel a means of livelihood (see 1 Cor. ix. 3-18, 2 Cor. xi. 8-9, Gal. vi. 6, and Schürer, ii., 1, pp. 318-319). —**ἤδη ποτέ.** An expressive combination = "already once more" (precisely = *schon wieder einmal*, which has a force corresponding to that of the Greek, which cannot be reproduced in English, that of the *unexpected* nature of the gift. So Ws.).—**ἀνεθάλετε.** The verb is very rare in secular Greek, while occurring nine times in LXX. This older aorist form takes the place of the more regular one five times in LXX. It is only found in the Bible. (See W-Sch., p. 110; Lobeck, *Paralipomena*, p. 557.) The verb is used both transitively and intransitively. Here it is probably transitive, as in Ezek. xvii. 24 and three other places in LXX (so De W., Ws., Lft., Holst., Lips., etc.). In that case **τὸ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ φρονεῖν** is the accusative governed by it. "You let your care for me blossom into activity again." Myr. thinks it inconsistent with the delicacy of Paul's tone in this passage to take it as transitive. But Paul expressly guards against hurting their feelings by correcting, as it were, his statement by the next clause in which he asserts, "You *did* truly care". This construction seems much more natural than to take **τὸ ὑπ. ἐ. φρ.** as an accusative of the inner object (so Myr., Gw., Hpt., Eadie). Moule, probably with justice, remarks that "the phrase is touched with a smile of gentle pleasantry" (*Philippian Studies*, p. 245).—**ἐφ' ᾧ.** The most various interpretations have been given. Some refer **ᾧ** to the whole phrase preceding. Some make **ἀναθάλλειν** the antecedent. Ell. renders, "with a view to which" (probably "my interests"; so also Gw., Beet); Lft. "in which" (taking it generally); Hfm. = **ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὅτι.** The simplest explanation is to regard **ἐμοῦ** as antecedent (so also Calv., Vaughan). "About whom (lit. = in whose case) you certainly *did* care, were anxious, but you had no opportunity of showing your care in a practical fashion." **ἐπί** as contrasted with **ὑπέρ** preceding would express a more indefinite relation to Paul. They were always, as he well knew, thoroughly interested in him. The *definite* relation is connected with the actual bestowing of the gift.—**ἠκαιρεῖσθε.** Lidd. and Scott quote one instance of the simple verb **ἀκαιρέω.** It is not certain whether he refers here to lack of means or the want of opportunity to send a gift. The imperfects show the habitual state of their feelings towards Paul.

Ver. 11. The form of vv. 11-13, from **ἐγὼ γάρ,** is strophic. **ἐγὼ . . . εἶναι** gives the "theme". Ver. 13 marks the close. The thought is worked out between. See J. Weiss, *Beitr.*, p. 29.—**οὐχ ὅτι.** See on chap. iii. 12 *supr.*—**καθ' ὑστέρησιν.** "As regards want." **κατά** has the same sense as in the phrase **τὰ κατ' ἐμέ.**—**ἐγώ** emphasises his own position in a tone of calm independence of circumstances.—**ἐν οἷς εἰμί.** Taken by itself, the phrase might well mean, "in my present circumstances". But in view of the following verses it seems better to make it general = "in the circumstances in which I am placed at any moment". For exx. of the phrase see Kypke and Wetst. *ad loc.*—**ἔμαθον** must be translated into English as a perfect, "I have learned". But the Greek has a true aorist force: it sums up his experiences to the moment of writing and regards them as a whole.—**αὐτάρκης** is admirably illustrated by Plat., *Repub.*, 369 B, **οὐκ αὐτάρκης, ἀλλὰ πολλῶν ἐνδεής.** "Dr. Johnson talked with approbation of one who had attained to the

a 2 Cor. xi. 7. See note *infr.*
b See ver. 18.
c 1 Cor. i. 5; 2 Cor. iv. 8, viii. 7; 1 Thess. v. 18.
d Only here in N.T.
e Often in Gospp. Ps. civ. 13.
f Luke xv. 14; 2 Cor. xi. 9; Heb. xi. 37; Sirach xi. 11.
g See note *infr.*
h Eph. v. 11; Rev. xviii. 4.
Luke xv. 17; 1 Cor. xiv. 12.

εἶναι. 12. οἶδα δὲ[1] [a]ταπεινοῦσθαι, οἶδα καὶ[2] [b]περισσεύειν· ἐν παντὶ καὶ ἐν πᾶσι [d]μεμύημαι καὶ [e]χορτάζεσθαι καὶ πεινᾶν, καὶ [b]περισσεύειν καὶ [f]ὑστερεῖσθαι. 13. πάντα [g]ἰσχύω ἐν τῷ [g]ἐνδυναμοῦντί με Χριστῷ.[3] 14. πλὴν καλῶς ἐποιήσατε [h]συγκοινωνήσαντές[4]

[1] So 137, some other minn. Edd. **και** with ℵABD, etc. Myr. supposes **δε** to have arisen from the last syll. of **οιδα**.

[2] A syr[sch.] om. **και**.

[3] So ℵ[c]D[c]Eg[r].Fg[r].GKLP, Ath., Cyr., Chr., Euth.[cod.], Thdrt., etc. Edd. om. **Χριστῳ** with ℵ*ABD* 17, d, e, f, r, vg. cop. arm. æth., Clem., Victorin., Ambrst. It was very probably added from 1 Tim. i. 12.

[4] So Lach., Trg., Alf. with ℵB[c]D[c]K[sil].LP. Ti., Ws., W.H. **συνκ.** with AB*D*EFG.

state of the philosophical wise man, that is, to have no want of anything. 'Then, sir,' said I, 'the savage is a wise man.' 'Sir,' said he, 'I do not mean simply being without,—but not having a want'" (Boswell's *Johnson*, p. 351, Globe ed.).

Ver. 12. **οἶδα κ.τ.λ. καί** must be read with all good authorities. The one **καί** must be correlative to the other, unless he intended to continue the sentence without the second **οἶδα** (see an excellent note on **καί** in N.T. in Ell. *ad loc.* He defines somewhat too minutely). Examples of the infinitive after **οἶδα** are to be found in classical Greek.—**ταπειν.** The best comment on this is 2 Cor. xi. 7, **ἐμαυτὸν ταπεινῶν ἵνα ὑμεῖς ὑψωθῆτε.** There it means, "keeping myself low" (in respect of the needs of daily life). Moule aptly quotes Diod., i., 36 (speaking of the Nile), **καθ' ἡμέραν . . . ταπεινοῦται** = "runs low".—**ἐν παντ. κ. ἐν π.** A vague, general phrase = "in all circumstances of life". It has no immediate connexion with **μεμύημαι** (*cf.* a similar expression **τῷ παντί** in Xen., *Hell.*, 7, 5, 12, and **τοῖς πᾶσιν** or **πᾶσιν** in Thucyd., Soph., etc.).—**μεμύημαι.** The verb was originally used of one initiated into the Mysteries. It came (like our own "initiated") to lose its technical sense. But the word probably implies a difficult process to be gone through. *Cf.* Ps. xxv. 14: "The *secret* of the Lord is with them that fear Him, and He will show them His covenant" (Vaughan), and Wisd. viii. 4, **μύστις γάρ ἐστιν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπιστήμης.** In later ecclesiastical usage **ὁ μεμυημένος** = a baptised Christian (an instructive hint as to the growth of dogma). See Anrich, *Das Antike Mysterienwesen*, p. 158. **μεμύ.** goes closely with the infinitives following. *Cf.* Alciphron, 2, 4 *ad fin.*, **κυβερνᾶν μυηθήσομαι.**—**χορτάζεσθαι** is a strong word, used originally of the feeding of animals, which gradually became colourless in the colloquial language (see *Sources of N.T. Greek*, p. 82).—**πεινᾶν** should be written without *iota subscript.* It is contracted here with **α** as usually in later Greek. See Phrynichus (ed. Lobeck), 61, 204. So always in LXX.—**ὑστερεῖσθαι** has the rare meaning "to be in want" (absol.), or rather (in middle), "to feel want". *Cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 9, and esp. Sirach xi. 11, **ἔστιν κοπιῶν καὶ πονῶν καὶ σπεύδων, καὶ τόσῳ μᾶλλον ὑστερεῖται.**

Ver. 13. **π. ἰσχ.** It is difficult to decide whether **π.** is accusative or merely adverbial. *Cf.* Jas. v. 16 (where apparently **ἰσχύει** has the accusative), and Wisd. xvi. 20, **ἄρτον . . . ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἔπεμψας . . . πᾶσαν ἡδονὴν ἰσχύοντα.** For the other alternative see Hom., *Odyss.*, 8, 214.—**ἐνδυν.** *Cf.* Eph. vi. 10, **ἐνδυναμοῦσθε ἐν Κυρίῳ**; Jud. vi. 34 (cod. A), **πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἐνεδυνάμωσεν τὸν Γεδεών.** It is a rare word. The adjective **ἐνδύναμος,** from which it springs, is only found in late Byzantine Greek. An apt parallel to the whole context is Ps. Sol. 16, 12, **ἐν τῷ ἐνισχῦσαί σε τὴν ψυχήν μου ἀρκέσει μοι τὸ δοθέν.**—**Χριστῷ** must be omitted. See crit. note *supr.*

Ver. 14. **πλήν.** See on chap. iii. 16. "All the same, I rejoice in your kindness."—**καλῶς.** Hort (on 1 Pet. 11, 12) points out that **καλός** "denotes that kind of goodness which is at once seen to be good".—**συνκ.** (the preferable spelling).

μου τῇ θλίψει.[1] 15. οἴδατε δὲ[2] καὶ ὑμεῖς, Φιλιππήσιοι, ὅτι ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, ὅτε ἐξῆλθον ἀπὸ Μακεδονίας, οὐδεμία[3] μοι ἐκκλησία ἐκοινώνησεν εἰς [i]λόγον [k]δόσεως καὶ λήψεως,[4] [k]εἰ μὴ ὑμεῖς μόνοι· 16. ὅτι καὶ ἐν Θεσσαλονίκῃ καὶ [l]ἅπαξ καὶ [l]δὶς εἰς[5] τὴν [m]χρείαν μοι[6] ἐπέμψατε. 17. οὐχ ὅτι [n]ἐπιζητῶ τὸ [o]δόμα, ἀλλ' ἐπιζητῶ τὸν

i See ver. 17. *Cf.* συναίρειν λόγον in Matt. xviii. 23, xxv. 19.
k Sirach xli. 19, xlii. 7. *Cf.* Jas. i.

17. l See note *infr.* m Ver. 19; Acts xx. 34; Rom. xii. 13 *al.* n Matt. vi. 32; Luke xii. 30; Rom. xi. 7 *al.* o Matt. vii. 11; Luke xi. 13. Often in LXX. See Grimm-Thayer *ad voc.*

[1] **τ. θλ. μ.** DEFG, O.L. vg.

[2] Om. **δε** Dgr.*Egr.* 37, 115 *al.*, syrp. arm. æth., Chr., Thdrt.

[3] **οτι** inserted before **ουδ.** by D*E*Fgr.G, d, e, g.

[4] So BcDcEKLP. Edd. **λημψ.** with ℵAB*D*FG.

[5] Om. **εις** AD*(E*) 39, 73, go. arm., æth., Victorin. Lach. and Lft. bracket.

[6] **μου** DELP, g, syrp. cop. arm., Proc., Thphl., Aug., Ambrst.

In classical usage (almost confined to Demosth.) this verb has the genitive of the thing in which a share is given. They had made common cause with his affliction (probably referring to his imprisonment). The bringing forward of **μου** emphasises their personal relation to the Apostle, which was apt to be obscured by the form of expression used.

Vv. 15-19. THEIR EARLIER AND LATER GENEROSITY AND ITS DIVINE REWARD.—Ver. 15. **δέ** marks the transition to his first experience of their generosity. "But this is no new thing, for you have always been generous. You know this as well as I do" (**καὶ ὑμεῖς**).—**Φιλιππήσ.** (A Latin form, see Ramsay, *Journal of Theol. Studies*, i., 1, p. 116.) He singles them out from all the other Churches.—**ἐν ἀρχ. τ. εὐαγ.** It is difficult to see (in spite of Haupt's objections) how this could mean anything else than "at the time when the Gospel was first preached to you". That had been about ten years previously. *Cf.* 1 Clem. 47, **ἀναλάβετε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου· τί πρῶτον ὑμῖν ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἔγραψεν;** probably this is the gift referred to in 2 Cor. xi. 9 (*cf.* Acts xviii. 5). He refused to take any pecuniary aid at Corinth lest the Judaising teachers should make it a ground for false charges.—**μοι . . . ἐκοινών.** This use (in N.T.) is apparently confined to the Epistles. A precise parallel (**κοιν.** with dative and **εἰς**) is found in Plat., *Repub.*, v., 453 A.—**εἰς λόγ. δ. κ. λ.** Lit. = "No Church communicated with me so as to have an account of giving and receiving" (debit and credit). The whole of the context has a colouring of financial terms. Probably Paul uses them in a half-humorous manner. The combination of **δ.** and **λ.** is frequent. *Cf.* Sirach xlii. 7, **δόσις καὶ λῆμψις παντὶ ἐν γραφῇ**, and in Latin authors, Cic., *Lael.*, 16, *ratio acceptorum et datorum.* Numerous exx. are given by Wetst. Paul had bestowed on them priceless spiritual gifts. It was only squaring the account that he should receive material blessings from them. Their mutual relations are expressed by the Apostle very delicately, as throughout this paragraph. His manner here gives a luminous view of his refined sensibility.

Ver. 16. **ὅτι κ.τ.λ.** We are greatly inclined to take **ὅτι** here, as in ver. 15, as dependent on **οἴδατε.** "Ye know . . . that at the beginning . . . that even in Thessalonica," etc. Thessalonica was a city of far greater wealth and importance than Philippi. **καί** might, however, emphasise the fact that they began *at once* to support him.—**ἅπαξ κ. δίς** is probably to be taken literally. *Cf.* Deut. ix. 13, **λελάληκα πρὸς σὲ ἅπαξ καὶ δίς**; 1 Macc. iii. 30, **εὐλαβήθη μὴ οὐκ ἔχει ὡς ἅπαξ καὶ δίς.** It is interpreted in a more general sense by Lft. and Wohl.—**εἰς τ. χρείαν. εἰς** should be read with most of the best authorities. It is probably used here in a semi-technical meaning often found in Papyri (see Dsm., *BS.*, pp. 113-115; *NBS.*, p. 23) and also in Paul, *e.g.*, 1 Cor. xvi. 1, **τῆς λογίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους**; Rom. xv. 26, **κοινωνίαν τινὰ ποιήσασθαι εἰς τοὺς πτωχούς.** It describes the object of gifts, collections, etc., or the various items in an account which have to be met. This interpretation accords with the financial colouring of the passage.

Ver. 17. **τὸ δόμα.** It is not the actual gift put into Paul's hands which has

p Rom. v. 20, vi. 1; 2 Thess. i. 3; 2 Pet. i. 8.
q Matt. vi. 2, 5, 16.
r No precise parallel to this sense. Verb common in N.T. and LXX.
s Eph. v. 2. ὀσμ. εὐωδ. often in LXX.
t Luke iv. 24; Acts x. 35 *al.* In LXX, *e.g.*, Isa. xlix. 8 *al.*
u Rom. xii. 1; 2 Cor. v. 9 *al.* Wisd. iv. 10, ix. 10.
v 1 Cor. xv. 43; Col. iii. 4 *al.*

καρπὸν τὸν [p]πλεονάζοντα εἰς λόγον ὑμῶν. 18. [q]ἀπέχω δὲ πάντα καὶ περισσεύω· [r]πεπλήρωμαι, δεξάμενος παρὰ[1] Ἐπαφροδίτου τὰ παρ' ὑμῶν,[2] [s]ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας, θυσίαν [t]δεκτήν, [u]εὐάρεστον τῷ Θεῷ. 19. ὁ δὲ Θεός μου πληρώσει[3] πᾶσαν χρείαν ὑμῶν κατὰ τὸν πλοῦτον[4] αὐτοῦ ἐν [v]δόξῃ, ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. 20. τῷ δὲ Θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ ἡμῶν ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

[1] A om. παρα.

[2] Dgr.*Egr.* add πενφθεν. FG, d, e, f, g, r, Iren., Cyp., Vict., Ambrst. add πεμφθεντα.

[3] πληρωσαι D*FG 17, 37, d, e, f, g, r, vg., Chr., Euth.cod., Cyr., Thdrt., Thphl., Vict., Ambrst.

[4] So Db et cEKL, Chr., Cyr. Edd. το πλουτος with ℵ*BD*FGP 17, 67**, Euth.cod.

brought him joy, but the giving (**δόσις**, ver. 15) and the meaning of that giving. It is the truest index to the abiding reality of his work.—**καρπὸν . . . πλεονάζοντα . . . λόγον.** We believe that Chr. is right in regarding these terms as belonging to the money-market. **ὁ καρπὸς ἐκείνοις τίκτεται** (Chr.). "Interest accumulating to your credit." This is favoured by the language of vv. 15-16 *supr.* **πλεονάζειν** is never used in a good sense in classical Greek, but always = "exceed," "go beyond bounds".

Ver. 18. **ἀπέχω.** The use of this word adds much force to the thought, when we bear in mind that it was the regular expression in the Papyri to denote *the receipt of what was due, e.g.*, Faijûm Pap., Sept. 6, A.D. 57: **ἀπέχω παρ' ὑμῶν τὸν φόρον τοῦ ἐλα[ι]ουργίου ὧν ἔχετε [μο]υ ἐν μισθώσει.** (Dsm., *NBS.*, p. 56.) Chr. evidently knew this sense, for he says, "**ἔδειξεν ὅτι ὀφειλή ἐστιν τὸ πρᾶγμα· τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν, ἀπέχω**". Thus the prevailing tone of the whole context is maintained. The word is almost = "I give you a receipt for what you owed me". The genial strain of humour is in no discord with his more serious thoughts. —**περισσεύω.** *Cf. Sayings of Jew. Fathers*, p. 64: "Who is rich? He that is contented with his lot."—**πεπλήρ.** Classical Greek would hardly use the word in this personal sense. The closing words of the verse have underlying them the idea of sacrifice. A gift to an Apostle or spiritual teacher seems to have been regarded in the Early Church, like the gifts brought in the Eucharist, as an offering to God. The recipient is looked upon as the representative of God (see Sohm, *Kirchenrecht*, pp. 74 ff., 81 *n.*).—**ὀσμ. εὐωδ.** "A scent of sweet savour."—**θυσίαν δεκτ.** "A technical term according to Sirach xxxii. 9" (Hpt.).—**εὐάρεστον.** *Cf.* Rom. xii. 1 ff., which bears closely upon the whole passage.

Ver. 19. **ὁ δὲ Θεός κ.τ.λ.** God's treatment of them corresponds to their treatment of Paul. They had ministered to his **χρεία**, so that he could say **πεπλήρωμαι.** That was the side of the reckoning which stood to their credit. Here is the other side. "My God shall repay what has been done to me His servant for the Gospel's sake. He, in turn, shall satisfy to the full (**πληρώσει**) *every need of yours.*" —**τὸ πλοῦτος** must be read. See crit. note *supr.* So also in 2 Cor. viii. 2, Eph. i. 7, ii. 7, iii. 8, 16, Col. i. 27, ii. 2. But **ὁ πλοῦτος** in Eph. i. 18, and repeatedly both in nominative, genitive and accusative singular. Modern Greek uses **πλοῦτος, βίος, θρῆνος** sometimes with **ὁ**, sometimes with **τό**. LXX generally has **ὁ.**—**ἐν δόξῃ.** The phrase is regarded by some (*e.g.*, Beng., Ws., Eadie, etc.) as = "in a lavish, magnificent way". This is to strain the sense. It is much more natural, comparing Rom. viii. 21, Eph. i. 18 (**τίς ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας**), to think of it as the future Messianic glory which Paul believed to be so near (so Lft., Kl., etc.).

Ver. 20. Doxology. *Doxologia fluit ex gaudio totius epistolae* (Beng.). On the phrase **τοὺς αἰῶνας τ. αἰώνων** see the excellent note in Grimm-Thayer *ad loc.*

Vv. 21-23. GREETINGS AND BENEDICTION.—Ver. 21. Perhaps this last para-

21. [w] Ἀσπάσασθε πάντα ἅγιον ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. ἀσπάζονται w Rom. xvi. 3; 1 Cor. xvi. 19 *al.*
ὑμᾶς οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ ἀδελφοί. 22. ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι,
μάλιστα δὲ οἱ ἐκ[1] τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας.

23. Ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν[2] Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ πάντων[3]
ὑμῶν. ἀμήν.[4]

Πρὸς Φιλιππησίους ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ῥώμης δι' Ἐπαφροδίτου.[5]

[1] B απο.

[2] So Dgr.Egr.P, kscr., f, r, syrsch. et p. cop. æth., Chr., Thdrt., Victorin., Ambrst. Edd. om. ημων with ℵABFgr.GKL, d, e, g, arm., Euth.cod.

[3] So also Myr. with ℵcKL, syrr., Chr., Thdrt., Thphl. Edd. μετα του πνευματος with ℵ*ABDEFGP 6, 17, 31, 47, d, e, f, g, r, vg. cop. arm. æth., Euth.cod., Victorin., Ambrst.

[4] So ℵADEKLP *et al.*, d, e, r, vg. cop. syrr. arm. æth., Thdrt., Dam., Ambrst. Ti., Ws., W.H. om. αμην with BFG 47, f, g, sah., Chr., Euth.cod., Vict.

[5] So KL, syrr., Thdrt., etc. Edd. προς φιλιππησιους with ℵAB 17, 135. The latter form is plainly the more ancient, the other being an expansion based on the contents of the Epistle.

graph may have been written by the Apostle's own hand (so Von Soden and Laurent, *op. cit.*, p. 9). *Cf.* Gal. vi. 11. —**ἐν X. Ἰ.** These words are to be taken in close connexion with **ἀσπάσασθε**. *Cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 19, **ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἐν Κυρίῳ πολλὰ Ἀκύλας.** — **ἀδελφοί.** Perhaps these were Roman Christians who aided Paul in his labours (see M'Giffert, *Ap. Age*, p. 397). At least they would be included.

Ver. 22. **μάλιστα.** If by this time, as is probable (see *Introduction*), Paul had been removed from his lodging to one of the state prisons near the palace, it is plain that Christians of the Imperial household would have special opportunities of close intercourse with him.— **οἱ ἐκ τῆς K. οἰκίας.** See esp. SH., *Romans*, pp. 418-423, as supplementary to Lightfoot's important discussion; and also, Riggenbach, *Neue Jahrb. f. deutsche Th.*, 1892, pp. 498-525, Mommsen, *Handbuch d. röm. Alterth.*, ii., 2 (ed. 3), pp. 833-839. SH. point out that a number of the names mentioned for salutation in Rom. xvi. occur in the *Corpus* of Latin Inscriptions as members of the Imperial household, which seems to have been one of the chief centres of the Christian community at Rome. In the first century A.D. most of the Emperor's household servants came from the East. Under Claudius and Nero they were people of real importance. And we find, from history, that Christian slaves had great influence over their masters. See Friedländer, *Sittengeschichte Roms*, i., pp. 70 ff., 74, 110-112.

Ver. 23. Probably **μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος** ought to be read with all the chief authorities instead of **πάντων**. Myr., however, supposes that these words have been inserted from Gal. vi. 18, to which he would also attribute **ἡμῶν** *supr.*, which is probably spurious.

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO THE

COLOSSIANS

INTRODUCTION.

Section I.—Colossæ, Laodicea, Hierapolis.

Colossæ was a city of Phrygia, situated on the southern bank of the Lycus, a tributary of the Mæander. The river passes here through a narrow gorge, by sheer and rocky sides. Its water is nauseous, and impregnated to a most unusual degree with carbonate of lime, which has formed very remarkable incrustations along its course. Rising steep from the glen in which the city lay was Mount Cadmos, towering to a height of 7,000 feet. The district is volcanic and subject to earthquakes, and a very disastrous one destroyed Laodicea, and probably Colossæ and Hierapolis, in the reign of Nero. The soil was very fertile; and its pastures reared a noted breed of sheep. Both Colossæ and Laodicea were very famous for their woollen manufactures. The former town was at one time of great importance, and is mentioned as such by Herodotus (vii., 30) and Xenophon (Anab., i., 2, 6). But the foundation of Laodicea, probably in the reign of Antiochus II. (261-246 B.C.), gave the death-blow to its supremacy. This city was only eleven miles distant, lying also on the south of the Lycus, but in a position far better fitted to secure commercial success. It was one of the richest cities in the province of Asia, and recovered from its destruction by the earthquake without receiving help from imperial funds. The third town mentioned in this Epistle, Hierapolis, lay to the north of the Lycus, six miles from Laodicea, opposite to which it stood, and thirteen from Colossæ. Its name indicates its character as a sacred city, and it "was the centre of native feeling and Phrygian nationality in the valley" (Ramsay). While it was influenced, especially as to its form, by Greece, "the religion continued to be Lydo-Phrygian". The population of Colossæ was probably for the most part Phrygian, with Greek admixture. In Laodicea the Jews were fairly numerous, though less so than at Apameia, and in this respect Colossæ probably resembled it. The Talmud says that the wines and baths of Phrygia had separated

the Ten Tribes from Israel; and we have evidence that the Phrygian Jews compromised with heathenism to an extent possible only to those who held their ancestral faith most loosely. They probably accepted Christianity readily, and thus lost their racial identity.

We have no information as to the introduction of Christianity into these cities, in all of which Churches had been planted. They had not been founded by Paul, though some of their members were known to him. They seem to have owed their origin to Epaphras, who was probably one of Paul's converts, and since the Apostle gives emphatic approval to his teaching, they had been instructed in the Pauline type of doctrine. Apparently they consisted for the most part of Gentiles (this is suggested, though not proved, by i. 21, 27, ii. 13, iii. 7). We may conjecture from iv. 10 that Paul had written an earlier letter to them, to which they had sent a reply by Epaphras. Recently they had been assailed by a form of false teaching, and while they remained, so far, loyal to the doctrine they had been taught (i. 4, ii. 5), the danger was sufficiently serious to call forth this letter, which had perhaps been preceded by a letter addressed to Laodicea. It was sent by Tychicus, who was accompanied by Onesimus, Philemon's runaway slave, whom Paul was sending back to his master, with a letter asking forgiveness for the culprit.

Section II.—Angelology.

Since this subject has an important relation to the false teaching in the Colossian Church, to the authenticity of the Epistle and the exegesis of several passages, it is necessary to treat it in some detail so far as this is relevant here, and more convenient to devote a special section to it. The doctrine of angels has considerable prominence in the Old Testament, but received great development in later Judaism, both among the Rabbis and in the apocalyptic literature. The influence of these ideas on the New Testament writers is very marked. In this connexion the points to be specially noticed are the relation of the angels to nature and men, their ethical character, their ranks and their association with the Law.

In the O.T. the connexion of the angels with the forces of nature is not made prominent. The cherubim, it is true, appear in close connexion with natural phenomena, and probably were originally identical with the thunder-cloud. But we have no warrant for regarding them as angels. In Ps. civ. 4 God's messengers and ministers are said to be made of wind and fire. In later literature this

thought receives great extension. According to the older Jewish representation their work in nature was limited to extraordinary cases; but later this was not so, and the whole world was thought to be full of spirits and demons. In the Book of Jubilees the angels are brought into close relation with the elements. The author mentions angels of fire, wind, tempest, darkness, hail, hoar-frost, valleys, thunder, lightning, cold, heat, the seasons, dawn and evening, and all spirits of His works in heaven and earth. Similarly in Enoch lx. we read of spirits of sea, hoar-frost, hail, snow, mist, dew and rain. Again in the Slavonic Enoch xix. 4 we have "the angels who are over seasons and years, and the angels who are over rivers and the sea, and those who are over the fruits of the earth, and the angels over every herb, giving all kind of nourishment to every living thing". In the N.T. this conception is also found, especially in the Apocalypse. Thus we read of an angel "that hath power over fire" (xiv. 18) and an "angel of the waters" (xvi. 5), *cf.* also vii. 1, viii. 5, 7-12. The interpolation in John v. 4 presents us with the same idea in the angel that troubled the waters. In Heb. i. 7 the language of Ps. civ. 4 is reversed, and God is said to make His angels winds and His ministers a flame of fire. A similar belief in the evanescent personality of the angels is expressed in the Rabbinical statements of the daily creation of angels, and their transformation now into this, now into that. While these thoughts are all but unknown to the O.T., it frequently connects the sons of God with the stars. In the Song of Deborah the stars fight against Sisera (Jud. v. 20); in Job xxxviii. 7 the morning stars are identified with the sons of God. In Neh. ix. 6 the host of heaven is actually said to worship God, and by this personal beings must be meant (*cf.* Is. xxiv. 21 with ver. 23). In Enoch we read of "a prison for the stars of heaven and the host of heaven" (xviii. 14), and of "the stars which have transgressed the commandment of God, and are bound here till ten thousand ages, the number of the days of their guilt, are consummated" (xxi. 6). A similar association is found in Rev. ix. 1 (*cf.* ver. 11). A closely related function of the angels is that of ruling and representing the nations. This is first found in Deut. iv. 19, xxxii. 8, LXX (*cf.* xxix. 26). According to these passages the nations are allotted to the host of heaven or the sons of God, while Yahweh chooses Israel for Himself (*cf.* Sirach xvii. 17). This undergoes a development in Daniel. In Deuteronomy the nations have their angels, while Israel has Yahweh. In Daniel Israel also has its own angel, Michael. In Is. xxiv. 21-23 we find the same thought, the host of the high ones on high being connected with the kings of the earth. In Rabbinical literature we have a

similar idea; the angels of the nations have a relation of solidarity with their peoples, and God punishes them before He punishes the nations themselves (Weber, *System der pal. Theol.*, 1880, p. 165). In the N.T. the angels of the seven churches in the Apocalypse are to be interpreted in a similar way.

From the functions which the angels exercise it might be expected that ethical distinctions would not be made prominent. In the older Biblical literature there is no reference to evil spirits, in the modern sense of the term. The angels are instruments to effect Yahweh's will. They are good or evil not in virtue of intrinsic character, but of the mission on which they may be sent. The "angels of evil" who bring the plagues on Egypt (Ps. lxxviii. 49), the "destroyer" who smites the first born (Ex. xii. 23), the evil spirit that troubles Saul, the angel that slays the Israelites (2 Sam. xxiv. 16, 17), or Sennacherib's army with the pestilence, the lying spirit in the mouth of Ahab's prophets, the cynical Satan who smites Job in property, family and person to prove that he does not serve God for nought, all alike belong to the heavenly host and are God's servants, who live to do His will. They are evil so far as their mission is to inflict evil. Our distinction between good and evil angels is unknown; moral features, if present, are rudimentary. When they are called the "holy ones" no ethical reference is intended, but simply their consecration to the service of God. Immoral actions are attributed to them. Thus the sons of God have children by the daughters of men (Gen. vi. 1-4), and the host of the high ones on high have to be visited with punishment for the wrongs done by the kingdoms under their charge (Isa. xxiv. 21). In Ps. lxxxii. the Elohim are rebuked by God in the heavenly assembly for their unrighteous rule, and this is so also in Ps. lviii. In Job we have similar thoughts. Twice Eliphaz insists on the imperfection of the angels, once in his wonderful description of the spirit who said to him, "Behold He putteth no trust in His servants, and His angels He chargeth with folly" (iv. 18); and again, speaking for himself, "Behold He putteth no trust in His holy ones; yea the heavens are not clean in His sight" (xv. 15). (Similarly Job himself, xxi. 22, though Duhm corrects the text.) Bildad also says that God "maketh peace in His high places," and that "the stars are not pure in His sight" (xxv. 2, 5). In later Jewish theology, when the distinction of angels and demons has become explicit, the angels are frequently represented as far from perfect. The proof of this may be seen in Weber. The following points may be selected for mention. The angels envied Israel the Law; "the angels of ministry coveted it, and it was concealed from them". On Sinai God gave Moses the

face of Abraham, the entertainer of angels, that the angels might do him no harm. They raise objections to God's decrees, and not in vain; they even prevent His wishes from being carried into execution. Gabriel was disobedient, and was punished on that account; but Dubbiel, who was set in his place, showed himself hostile to Israel, and was therefore replaced by Gabriel. Judgments are inflicted on the angel princes. Their sinlessness is only relative; sin is wanting only in so far as it is rooted in sensuality. A similar view is found in Enoch: the stars are punished for disobedience, and the "watchers" for their union with the daughters of men. It is also clear that where angels are thought of as elemental spirits the question of their morality can hardly arise. In the Apocalypse the angels of the Churches are praised or blamed for the spiritual condition of these Churches, which shows once more how unjustifiable is the sharp division of angels into the two classes of perfectly sinless and irremediably evil. Angels are mentioned which are not evil spirits, and yet are not wholly good.

In the O.T. not much is said which would lead us to infer any gradation of rank among angels, though in Daniel an elementary system of division is present. In Rabbinical theology we have a developed hierarchy, in which ten orders are enumerated (Weber, p. 153). In Enoch we read: "And He will call on all the host of the heavens and all the holy ones above, and the host of God, the Cherubim, Seraphim and Ophanim, and all the angels of powers and all the angels of principalities, and the Elect One, and the other powers on the earth, over the water, on that day" (lxi. 10). Similarly we read in the Slavonic Enoch that in the seventh heaven Enoch saw "a very great light and all the fiery hosts of great archangels, and incorporeal powers; cherubim and seraphim, thrones and the watchfulness of many eyes. There were ten troops, a station of brightness" (xx. 1, *cf.* 3). Ranks of angels are recognised also in the N.T.

In Deut. xxxiii. 2 we have in our present text, which probably needs correction, a reference to the coming of God to His people from Sinai and from "holy myriads". The LXX reads "with the myriads of Kadesh," but has a reference to "angels with Him on His right hand" in the next clause. This passage was interpreted to mean that the Law had been given through angels. We find this in Rabbinical writings, also in the report of a speech of Herod the Great in Josephus, *Ant.*, xv., 5, 3. In the Book of Jubilees we have detailed accounts of the giving of precepts by the angels. We find a reference to this function of the angels in the speech of Stephen (Acts vii. 53, *cf.* ver. 38) and the Epistle to the Hebrews (ii. 2).

Turning now to Paul, we find marked coincidences with the later Jewish view. For the connexion of the angels with nature, we have his phrase the "elements of the world" (Gal. iv. 3, *cf.* ver. 9), which should be interpreted as personal elemental spirits, to which the pre-Christian world was in subjection (see note on ii. 8). The connexion with the stars is probably present in the phrase "celestial bodies" (1 Cor. xv. 40), a term which suggests that they were animated by spirits. The moral imperfection of angels is also a Pauline conception. He speaks of angels, principalities and powers, which might be expected to separate us from the love of God (Rom. viii. 38), he supposes the case of an angel from heaven preaching another doctrine than what he taught (Gal. i. 8), women have to be veiled at the Christian assemblies because of the angels (1 Cor. xi. 10, a precept suggested by Gen. vi. 1-4), the principalities and powers have to be subjected to the Son (1 Cor. xv. 24), the rulers of this world, through ignorance of God's wisdom, crucified the Lord of glory (1 Cor. ii. 6-8), Christians are to judge the angels (1 Cor. vi. 2). These passages, it is true, have been otherwise explained. But the exegesis has been unnaturally forced through the initial mistake of assuming that the angelic world is sharply divided into sinless and fallen spirits. Once this is surrendered the natural interpretation becomes possible. Again we find ranks of angels recognised by Paul. In Rom. viii. 38 we have "angels and principalities and powers," in Cor. xv. 24 we have "every principality and every authority and power," in Thess. iv. 16 the archangel is mentioned. He also shares the belief that the Law was given by the mediation of angels (Gal. iii. 19).

When we approach the Epistle to the Colossians and its companion Epistle by this line of investigation we find nothing that should cause us any surprise. A worship of angels, such as was inculcated by the false teachers, was quite a natural application of the Jewish doctrine. Gfrörer says: "According to the testimonies cited, the entire activity of God in the world is mediated through angels. This belief was not without special dangers. One could easily fall into the error that the angels should be worshipped instead of God, since they help men more than the Eternal. That at the time of the Second Temple there really were men who taught this we see from the utterance of the Apostle Paul (Col. ii. 18)" (*Jahrhundert des Heils*, i., p. 376). A proof of the custom among the Jews is often quoted from the Preaching of Peter, in which the Jews are said to worship angels and archangels. Celsus brings a similar charge against the Jews, and numerous Talmudical prohibitions attest the prevalence of this cult. The opening section of the

Epistle to the Hebrews is thought by some to be directed against angel worship, but this is improbable. Twice in the Apocalypse the angel who shows the visions to the writer restrains him from an attempt to worship him. This seems to have a polemical reference to angel worship. There is a similar passage in the Ascension of Isaiah, vii. 21, *cf.* viii. 4, 5. In the Testament of Levi the seer asks the angel to tell him his name that he may call upon him in the day of trouble. So in the Testament of Dan, the patriarch bids his children "draw near to God and the angel". We have no ground in the angel worship for assuming a post-Pauline date, since already before Paul's time the conditions for it were present. That the angelic orders were created by the Son follows from the fact that the creation of all was ascribed by Paul to Christ (1 Cor. viii. 6), combined with the fact that, as we have seen, Paul recognised the existence of angelic orders. That he adds "thrones" and "lordships" to the list in Colossians is no proof of difference of authorship, for in the undisputed Epistles the lists, which he gives, vary. That they are included in the scope of the Son's work of reconciliation cannot be objected to on the ground that they did not need this, for the doctrine of angelic sinlessness is contrary to the teaching of Paul, as also to that of the O.T. and Jewish theology. A more plausible difficulty may be urged as to the method of Redemption. The death of Christ was a death in the body of flesh, and thus availed to destroy the sinful flesh in humanity. But it might be said, How can this have any effect on the angelic world? Should we not say: "Not of angels doth He take hold, but He taketh hold of the seed of Abraham"? It is true that the N.T. writers, Paul included, think in the main of the effects of Christ's death on mankind. But in face of the false teaching it was natural for Paul to draw an inference already implicit in his doctrine. Wherever sin was present, there grace was present to meet it; and this grace found its expression in the Cross of Christ. No limit could be set to its saving power; for angels as for men it made complete atonement. And the relation to the angels which this involved is just what we should expect in Paul. The redemption of man was made possible by Christ's Headship of the race. That He was the Head of the angelic world was a natural thought to Paul, once he regarded Christ as its Creator, and realised its need for redemption. His connexion with it went back to its creation, and therefore His redeeming acts could avail for it, as for the race of men. It was also a natural thought for Paul, since the Cross abolished the Law, and the Law had been given by angels, that in the death of Christ God had despoiled and triumphed over

the angelic powers. That the angels of the Law had brought about the death of Christ is the probable sense of 1 Cor. ii. 6-8. That they did it in ignorance of God's wisdom tallies with the statement that it is through the Church that the manifold wisdom of God is to be made known to the principalities and powers. It is not in virtue of any personal hostility to Christ that they crucified Him, but in virtue of their complete identity with the Law. The Law was against us, and Law and grace are incompatible. If so, the angels of the Law would necessarily, according to Jewish angelology, stand in opposition to Christ, till they were despoiled of the dominion they had exercised and placed in their true position. So far then from holding any position of authority, or exercising any mediatorial function, they are for the Christian as if they were not. He has died to the Law, and therefore to the angels of the Law, and all those elemental spirits, to which both Judaism and heathenism had been in subjection. All that he hoped to win through worship of them, and more than all, he has already in Christ. To serve them is to fall back into bondage to unmeaning ordinances, to miss the substance while clutching at the shadow. The angelology of the Epistle is thus in harmony with that of Paul, as gathered from the certainly genuine Epistles; and where it shows advance, the development is on thoroughly Pauline lines, and amply accounted for by the false teaching which it refutes. There is no reason to doubt the authenticity of the Epistle on the ground of its doctrine of angels. It is an interesting fact that the Council of Laodicea, about the middle of the fourth century, condemned angel worship; and the worship of Michael, which Theodoret, in the fifth century, speaks of as still carried on in the district, existed into the Middle Ages.

Section III.—The False Teaching and its Reputation.

The false teaching against which the Epistle is chiefly directed was of a Jewish type. This is clear alike from the characteristics mentioned and the nature of the polemic. It insisted on observance of regulations as to meats and drinks, festivals, new moons and Sabbaths. It drew on the tradition of men as its source. The reference to circumcision seems to show that the false teachers attached value to it; and the declaration that the Law has been abolished, which forms the basis for the definite attack, shows that they regarded it as still binding. Other characteristics are mentioned which are not so exclusively Jewish. It is spoken of as a philosophy and empty deceit, which was plausible and gave a reputation for

wisdom. It had the "elements of the world" and not Christ for its content; and was characterised by a humility which found expression in the worship of angels, but was not incompatible with fleshly conceit. It inculcated severity to the body, and imposed ordinances against certain foods. It is possible that the teachers asserted that they had visions of angels (ii. 18), but unfortunately the phrase from which this is inferred is exegetically uncertain and possibly corrupt. The false teachers were Christians, as is clear from the words, "not holding fast the Head"; but probably they did not assign to Christ His true place. It is possible that they thought of Christ as Paul did, and did not see that their peculiar views were incompatible with their doctrine of Christ; but this seems less likely.

It is not unnatural that many scholars should have seen in this teaching something which, while partially, was not wholly Jewish. And the most obvious solution, especially for those who dated the Epistle in the second century, was to regard the heresy as a form of Judaistic Gnosticism. In favour of this were alleged the use of the term "philosophy," the stress laid on "wisdom," the counter-presentation of Christianity as "full knowledge of the mystery," the asceticism which forbade drinks as well as meats, the angel worship which might rest on a doctrine of intermediaries between men and God, the emphasis on the universality of the Gospel in contrast to the exclusiveness of an intellectual aristocracy. It is certainly difficult to find full-blown Gnosticism mirrored in our Epistle. But it is also improbable that we have Gnosticism even in a rudimentary form. We are certain of the Jewish nature of the teaching, and if it can be explained from Judaism alone, we have no warrant for calling in other sources. "Philosophy" was a term used by Philo and Josephus for purely Jewish theology or sects; and in a Gentile community the common Greek term would naturally be employed, whatever the character of the system might be. Hort suggests that the term is used in a sense akin to the later use to denote the ascetic life, but this is uncertain. The stress on "wisdom" and "knowledge" may be paralleled from the Corinthian Church, where there was certainly no Gnosticism. Intellectual exclusiveness was no monopoly of the Gnostics; the Pharisees, with their contempt for the people of the land, accursed through their ignorance of the Law, were conspicuous examples of it; and it is a failing common enough in certain types of character. The angelolatry, as we have seen already, is perfectly explicable from the Judaism of Paul's time. The prohibition of drinks, while it goes beyond the Law, is an extension of it, for which we find a parallel

in Heb. ix. 10. Asceticism, it is true, is hardly a characteristic of Judaism. Yet fasting was considered to have a religious value, especially among the Pharisees, and Paul himself buffeted the body and brought it into bondage. Nor is it clear whether asceticism was regarded as an end in itself or a means to an end. It might be practised to induce visions. But, apart from this, it is a tendency so congenial to certain temperaments that all need for postulating a Gnostic origin, through a belief in the evil of matter, disappears.

It has, with more plausibility, been suggested that we should seek for its origin in Essenism, or some form of teaching with Essene affinities. In favour of this it may be said that the Essenes were extremely rigid in keeping the Sabbath, they had some secret lore about the angels, they abstained from meat and wine, they eliminated marriage from their communal life. But there is no indication of any extreme Sabbatarianism at Colossæ; what Paul attacks is the view that the Sabbath law should be regarded as still binding. The doctrine of angels has been already amply explained apart from Essenism, while we have no proof that the Essenes worshipped angels. Nor are we acquainted with the precise view of the false teachers as to eating and drinking, whether this involved abstinence from meat and wine. In any case the precepts of the Law as to food, with the extension they appear to have received in later Judaism (Heb. ix. 10), seem sufficient to account for this phase of the false teaching. And there is not a word in the Epistle to warrant us in assuming that there was any attack on marriage at Colossæ. Further, there is no reference to some of the most important Essene practices. Such are their frequent washings, their alleged worship of the sun, their communal life, their "fearful oath" on initiation, their protracted and severe probation and their use of magic. And, lastly, we know nothing of Essenism at this time in Phrygia. For the most part the sect had its home by the Dead Sea, and before the destruction of Jerusalem it seems to have been unknown outside Palestine. Klöpper tries to turn the edge of these arguments by limiting this element to a dynamic influence of Essene principles on the Jews of the Dispersion, by urging that we should expect the larger movement of Essenes to Christianity after the destruction of Jerusalem to have been preceded by isolated instances, and by the reminder that we know the heresy only imperfectly. Lightfoot similarly is content to argue for Essene affinities in the false teaching. But in face of the absence from it of some of the most striking features of Essenism, and the possibility of accounting for it from contemporary Judaism, it seems much safer to set aside this theory

as to its origin. In the modified form given to it by Klöpper it scarcely seems worth contending for at all.

It is noteworthy that Paul does not, as in Galatians, attack this teaching by arguments drawn from the O.T. This has been explained by the view that the errors were not doctrinal but practical. But this seems to be improbable, and it is more likely that Paul does not establish his positions by proof passages because this would have been unconvincing to his antagonists, who might perhaps have evaded their force by allegorical interpretation. His refutation consists partly in pointing the moral of their own experience, partly in a positive exposition of great Christian truths with which the false teaching was incompatible, partly in direct attack. In recalling them to their own experience of salvation, he is throughout suggesting that the Gospel which had thus proved its power in them stood in no need of being supplemented; all that was necessary was for them to hold firmly by the form in which they had learnt it, and strive continually to appropriate its meaning and power more completely. The teachers by failing to hold fast the Head were cutting themselves off from the source of life. He reminds his readers that they had passed into the kingdom of the Son from the realm of darkness, they had received deliverance, the forgiveness of sins, had been reconciled to God, and been qualified for the saints' inheritance in light. They must be loyal to the truth they had heard, walk in Christ, rooted and built up in Him. This truth was not proclaimed to and tested by them alone, it was proved by its rapid extension in the world. Doctrinally the false teaching was tacitly refuted by an exhibition of the true place and work of the Son. He is the image of God, Lord of the universe, in whom all things were created, including all ranks of angels. They were created through Him and even for Him, so that as to origin they were dependent on, and as to end subservient to Him. The whole fulness dwelt in Him, and therefore reconciliation of all things to God, again including the angels, could be made by Him. And thus not only is there no room for angelic mediators; they themselves needed to be reconciled to God. It is in Christ that all the fulness of the Godhead dwells; it is in Him that all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are hidden. His death abolished the Law and spoiled the principalities and powers; hence the precepts of the former held good no longer, and worship ought plainly not to be offered to the latter. Believers had died with Christ to these elemental spirits, and could no longer be subject to their restrictions. The direct attack may be thus summarised. This so-called "philosophy" is only an empty delusion

resting on human tradition, with the elements of the world and not Christ for its content; in holding fast to antiquated ordinances it lets slip the substance to grasp the shadow; it is, in spite of its humility, a manifestation of fleshly conceit, but devoid of real wisdom; and the things from which it commands abstinence are so insignificant that they perish in the act of use.

Section IV.—The Authenticity of the Epistle.

The external evidence for the Pauline authorship of the Epistle is as strong perhaps as we have any right to expect. It is first referred to by name in the Muratorian Canon and by Irenæus. It was probably used by Justin Martyr and Theophilus; and it is not unlikely that there are echoes of it in Barnabas, Clement of Rome and Ignatius. But these are quite insufficient to prove acquaintance with the Epistle, still less the Pauline authorship. It is more important that Marcion included it in his canon, but this again is not at all conclusive proof of the genuineness. The question has to be settled by the evidence drawn from the Epistle itself. On the ground of internal evidence many critics have decided against its authenticity. Mayerhoff (1838) was the first to reject it. The Tübingen school, including Hilgenfeld, treated it as a second century work. Ewald thought that Timothy wrote it after consultation with Paul. Holtzmann (1872), following a view indicated by Hitzig, recognised a Pauline nucleus, but regarded more than half of the Epistle as non-Pauline. Von Soden (1885) reduced considerably the range of interpolation in a series of articles on Holtzmann's hypothesis, but has since recognised the whole Epistle as Pauline, with the exception of i. 16^{b}, 17, which he thinks may be a gloss, since it disturbs the symmetry.

The authenticity has been impugned on various grounds: the language and style, the false teaching, the angelology, the Christology, the likeness to Ephesians. Enough has been said already of the false teaching and the angelology, so that it is needless to add anything here. The Epistle has a considerable number of words which are peculiar to itself, but on the whole not an exceptional number (34); and the contents of ch. ii. would have made even a larger proportion not at all strange. Greater difficulties are caused by the style. It is heavier and less impetuous than in Galatians Corinthians and Romans. Several of the logical particles most common in Paul are almost absent. There are also strange collocations of words (of which Haupt gives a good list), many being

combinations of two or three dependent genitives, accumulated synonyms, numerous compound words. But these features may be partially paralleled in the earlier letters; and where they cannot be we may rightly lay stress on the difference of Paul's circumstances and the problems with which he had to deal. Letters written in the heat of conflict with Judaisers and impugners of his authority, written too when he was in full career as a missionary and had pressing on him the care of all the Churches, must in the nature of the case be very different from a letter written, not to fight for the very existence of the Gospel, but to warn a still loyal Church against a pernicious error, and written in enforced retirement, with ample time for meditation.

The Christology, it is true, presents an advance on what we find in the earlier Epistles. Not in the position it assigns to the Son as Creator, for that is found in 1 Cor. viii. 6, but in that it speaks of Him also as the goal of the universe. Elsewhere it is God who is thus spoken of (1 Cor. viii. 6, Rom. xi. 36). But this is less cogent than it appears at first sight. Paul teaches that all things have to become subject to the Son, that He may deliver the Kingdom to the Father (1 Cor. xv. 24-28). And it would be as warrantable to conclude that Romans and 1 Corinthians were by different authors, for in the passages already mentioned creation is said to have been effected, now through God (Rom. xi. 36), and now again through Christ (1 Cor. viii. 6). A doctrine of Christ quite as lofty is found in Philippians; and the conclusive refutation of the false teaching was just this setting of the Son in His true position. The doctrine of Christ's work is expressed in a thoroughly Pauline way, which bears all the marks of authenticity. It is not a slavish imitation, but a fresh and luminous presentation. And yet it is in such perfect harmony with Paul's own doctrine that it seems improbable that it can be due to another hand; and more than improbable when we remember that no other early Christian writer known to us, with the partial exception of the author of 1 Peter, has been able to reproduce the Pauline doctrine, any more than Penelope's wooers could bend Odysseus' bow. The only point under this head which raises suspicion is the extension of the reconciliation to God effected by Christ to the angelic powers. What has been already said on this need not be repeated here.

Lastly, its relation to Ephesians has aroused suspicion. The problem thus presented is unique in the N.T., and has elicited numerous solutions. It has been pressed against the authenticity of Ephesians more generally than of Colossians; though Mayerhoff

thought that Ephesians was genuine and Colossians the copy. If one Epistle is copied from the other, suspicion is aroused only against the copy; and since, if this is the relation, Colossians is more likely than Ephesians to be the original, we should find in this fact a proof of the genuineness of the former. For if a later writer wrote a letter purporting to come from Paul, and used in it a letter that bore Paul's name, there is a strong presumption that the latter would be of well-attested genuineness. But the problem is hardly so simple. Holtzmann, in a work described by Godet "as a masterpiece of exactness, patient labour and wisdom," reached the conclusion that the Epistles exhibit the phenomenon of mutual indebtedness. Sometimes Ephesians seems to be the original, sometimes Colossians. Accordingly he formulated the theory that Paul wrote an Epistle to the Colossians, on the basis of which a later writer composed Ephesians. He then returned to the original Epistle and expanded it by free extracts from his own writing, adding also a polemic against Gnosticism. This theory was examined by Von Soden, who tested very carefully Holtzmann's reconstruction of the original Epistle. He also pointed out that it was justifiable to eliminate only such passages as Paul could not have written. He rejected only i. 15-20, ii. 10, 15, 18^{b}. This was in 1885. A more exhaustive study of Paulinism has led him to accept the authenticity of the Epistle as a whole in his commentary (1891). Holtzmann's theory is examined by Dr. Sanday and Dr. Robertson in the articles "Colossians" and "Ephesians" in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* (2nd ed.), and to these discussions the reader may refer for fuller details. J. Weiss in a review of Abbott's commentary has recently expressed himself in favour of a solution, not precisely in Holtzmann's form, but on his lines (*Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 29th Sept., 1900). It may be said here that it is hard to understand why a writer should give himself so much trouble. His purpose would have been served by one Epistle, a still larger "Ephesians," in which what he inserted in Colossians should have found its home. Very few have accepted the theory in its entirety. Yet if Holtzmann's observations are correct, only two theories seem to be tenable, one the theory he has himself proposed, the other that both Epistles are genuine. His own theory is far too complicated to be probable. The similarities occur often in different contexts, and express quite different ideas, yet each is natural in its place. This is difficult to account for in an imitator, who would be fettered by the document which he was using; but in a writer such as Paul, rich in ideas but unused to formal composition, such resemblance and yet such

difference in letters written together was quite to be expected. No trace of the process has been left in the textual evidence, and this is a cogent argument against the theory. The only alternative, then, to Holtzmann's view seems to be that both letters were written by Paul; and thus his investigation becomes the firm basis for quite another result than the author contemplated. We cannot in that case speak of mutual indebtedness; the phenomena that suggested this explanation are amply accounted for by the unity of authorship. It is noteworthy that Jülicher, who has no leaning to traditional opinions, thinks that the best solution of the problem is to be found in the acceptance of the authenticity of both Epistles (*Einl. i. d. N.T.*, 1894, p. 97, but compare the more dubious tone of his article in the *Enc. Bibl.*, 1899). This view, it may be added, is confirmed by the close connexion of Colossians with Philemon, which, if genuine, all but guarantees the genuineness of Colossians; and that it is not authentic has been argued solely to dispose of its testimony to Colossians. We may therefore accept this Epistle with confidence as the work of Paul.

Section V.—Place and Date of Composition.

Since Paul was a prisoner when he wrote it, our only alternatives are Cæsarea and Rome. Meyer, Weiss, Haupt and others have argued for Cæsarea. What Weiss regards as decisive is that Paul speaks in Philemon of going to Colossæ on his release, whereas in Philippians, written from Rome, he says that he hopes to go into Macedonia. But this proves nothing, for Macedonia might have been taken on the way; and, besides, Paul's plans might have changed in the interval. Haupt thinks that the genuineness of the letters can be maintained only on the assumption that they were written at Cæsarea, since letters so unlike Philippians cannot have been written so near to it as their composition at Rome would demand. He thinks their peculiar character is best explained by the fact that Paul in his confinement, unable to preach, was driven in upon himself, and thought out more fully than before the implication of his Gospel. The fruit of this we find in Colossians and Ephesians. This is of too speculative a character to bear any weight. On the other hand, it is certainly more probable that a runaway slave should have fled to Rome than to Cæsarea; for although Cæsarea was nearer for Onesimus than Rome, the latter was more accessible, and afforded a far safer concealment. Paul's expectations of release were more natural at Rome than at Cæsarea.

During the latter part of his imprisonment at Cæsarea he knew that he was going to Rome. It would be necessary then to place the letter in the earlier part. But it does not well suit this, for Paul had for a long time been anxious to see Rome, and it is most unlikely that he should think of going to Colossæ first. It would be very strange, further, if Paul wrote from Cæsarea, that he should be silent about Philip, whose guest he had been shortly before, and should leave us with the impression that he was unsympathetic. The general situation presupposed in the Epistle suits Rome better than Cæsarea.

This would be practically certain if these Epistles were written after Philippians, as Bleek, Lightfoot and several English scholars suppose. But the more usual view which makes Philippians the latest of the Imprisonment-Epistles seems to be preferable. The argument from theological affinities is most precarious; and Colossians, as well as Philippians, presents striking parallels with Romans. The theological system of Paul was formed before he wrote our earliest Epistle, yet how little Paulinism there is in Thessalonians, or even in 1 Corinthians. We have no right to expect the thoughts of Colossians to reappear in Philippians, a simple letter of thanks to a Church where the Colossian type of false doctrine had not appeared. Indeed, how much there is in Colossians that does not recur in Ephesians, and how much Ephesians adds to what we find in Colossians! Yet these were written practically together. Three years at least lay between Romans and the earliest time at which Philippians could have been written, and less than eighteen months between this time and the latest date that can be assigned to Colossians. Further, Paul seems in Philippians to express a more decided conviction as to the speedy settlement of his fate than in Philemon; and he looks forward to death as a not unlikely contingency. In Philippians Paul also speaks of sending away Timothy shortly, whereas he is with Paul in Colossians. If 2 Tim. iv. 19 dates, as some scholars think, from this imprisonment, this would agree best with the priority of Colossians, for in Philippians Paul speaks of sending him away, in 2 Timothy we find him gone. This, however, is not very cogent. It seems best to adhere to the usual view and to date the Epistle during the early part of Paul's Roman Imprisonment. The year to which we assign it depends on the general view we take as to the chronology of Paul's life. We may perhaps place it in A.D. 59. [The article on "Chronology of the New Testament" by C. H. Turner in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* may be consulted.]

Section VI.—Selected Literature.

Of patristic commentaries those of Chrysostom (*Homilies*), Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret may be mentioned. Of later commentaries earlier than the modern period Calvin and Bengel are perhaps the most important. The chief modern commentaries by foreign writers are those of De Wette, Meyer, Ewald, Hofmann, Klöpper, Franke (in Meyer), Oltramare, Von Soden (*Hand-Commentar*), Wohlenberg (Strack-Zoeckler) and Haupt (latest edition of Meyer). Among English commentaries those of Eadie, Alford, Ellicott, Lightfoot, Findlay (in the *Pulpit Commentary*), Beet, Moule and Abbott (*International Critical Commentary*) may be mentioned. Klöpper is important for the discussion of theological questions, especially the angelology, but the style is very diffuse. Oltramare is very full and thorough, but at times eccentric. He is also quite ignorant of English work. Von Soden is valuable, and has frequently influenced Abbott. Much the best commentary on the Epistle is that of Haupt, which, though in Meyer, is an entirely new work. For close grappling with the thought of the Epistle it has no rival. It sometimes presses the argument from the connexion too far, and is perhaps sometimes too subtle; but these are very slight defects. We still need in English a commentary of this kind, to unravel the thought of this most difficult Epistle. Our most important works, those of Ellicott, Lightfoot and Abbott, are of special value from the philological standpoint. Lightfoot is very full on points of history, and contributes a valuable excursus on the Essenes. His discussions of special words are also full and luminous. He is less strong in exegesis and Biblical theology. Abbott is "mainly philological," and as such most thankworthy, especially for the frequent testing of Lightfoot's results. Findlay is also excellent and deserves to be much better known. Moule rests for the most part on Lightfoot, but is very scholarly and at times independent. Maclaren in the *Expositor's Bible* exhibits the insight and felicity of exposition which characterise all his work. Moule's *Colossian Studies* should also be mentioned.

For critical discussions the New Testament Introductions may be consulted, and especially Sanday's very valuable article in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* (2nd ed.). The most thorough critical discussion is Holtzmann's *Kritik der Epheser- und Kolosserbriefe* (1872), on which Von Soden wrote a series of elaborate articles in the *Jahrb. f. protestant. Theol.* for 1885. For the theology of the Epistle the

works on New Testament Theology and on Paulinism may be consulted. Everling's *Die paulinische Angelologie und Dämonologie* is the best work on a subject of great importance for the correct understanding of the Epistle. Lueken's *Michael* (1898) may also be mentioned. H. St. John Thackeray's *The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*, published since this commentary went to press, contains a useful chapter on angelology. G. C. Martin's commentary in the *Century Bible* appeared too late to be used in any way.

NOTE.—The text of the Epistle here printed is a critically revised text, and that on which the commentary is based. The abbreviations in the notes need no explanation. The commentary was finished in September, 1898; references to later literature have been sparingly introduced in proof. The author may be permitted to add that his chief concern has been to expound the thought, since it was desirable, in view of the limits assigned, to concentrate attention mainly on one side of exegesis, and in the English commentaries on the Epistle the philological side is already amply represented. It has therefore been necessary to assume much in the way of philological results in order to gain space for the elucidation of the thought.

ΠΑΥΛΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΥ

Η ΠΡΟΣ

ΚΟΛΑΣΣΑΕΙΣ[1] ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ.

I. 1. ΠΑΥΛΟΣ ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ, καὶ [a] 2 Cor. i. 1; Eph. i. 1; Τιμόθεος ὁ ἀδελφὸς 2. τοῖς ἐν Κολοσσαῖς[2] [a] ἁγίοις καὶ [b] πιστοῖς [b] 2 Cor. vi. Phil. i. 1. ἀδελφοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ· χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ [c] Θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν.[3] [c] iii. 17. 5.

[1] **Κολασσαεις**: Ln., Tr., W.H., R.V. with AB*KP. **Κολοσσαεις**: T., Ws. with ℵBᶜDFG, probably by assimilation to **Κολοσσαις** (i. 2).

[2] **Κολοσσαις**: T., W.H., R.V., Ws. with ℵBDEFGL. **Κολασσαις**: Ln., Tr. with KP 17, by assimilation to title.

[3] So T., Tr., W.H., R.V., Ws. with BDEKL 17. **και Κυριου Ιησου Χριστου**: added by T.R. [Ln.] with ℵACFG and most MSS. by assimilation to Pauline usage.

CHAPTER I.—Vv. 1, 2. SALUTATION OF PAUL AND TIMOTHY TO THE CHRISTIANS OF COLOSSÆ.—Ver. 1. **ἀπόστολος . . . διὰ θελ. Θεοῦ.** The reference to his apostleship is not due to any attack on his apostolic authority or teaching, as in the case of the Epistles to the Galatians or Corinthians, but, as in the Epistle to the Romans, to the fact that he was unknown to those to whom he was writing. Similarly reference is made to it in the Epistle to the Ephesians, the letter being sent to Churches, to some of which, probably, Paul was unknown. In writing to the Macedonian Churches it is not mentioned, for they had been founded by him and remained loyal.—**Τιμόθεος**: included in the salutations in Thess., 2 Cor., Phil. and Philm. He would be known by name to the Colossians as Paul's companion, but probably not personally. Ramsay's conjecture (also put forward by Valroger) that he may have founded the Church is unsupported and improbable (see ver. 7), while Ewald's view that he wrote the bulk of the Epistle, after consultation with Paul, has nothing to recommend it, and is open to serious objections. **ὁ ἀδελφός** is added to balance **ἀπόστολος**, and has no reference, as Chrysostom thought, to Timothy's official position.

Ver. 2. Paul does not address the Church as a Church. This has been explained by the fact that he stood in no official relation to the community, and therefore addressed individuals. But he does not mention the Church in *Philippians*, though he had founded it. The omission may be accidental; but he seems to have changed his custom in his later Epistles, since it occurs in all his letters to Churches from *Romans* downwards.—**ἁγίοις** may be an adjective (so Kl., Weiss and others), but more probably a substantive (so Mey., Ell., Lightf., Ol., Sod., Haupt, Abb.), since Paul seems not to use it in the plural in an adjectival sense, except in Eph. iii. 5, and in the salutations of 2 Cor., Eph. and Phil. it is certainly a substantive. Like **ἀδελφοῖς** it may be joined with **ἐν X.**, but should more probably be taken by itself. The saints are those who are set apart for God, as belonging to His holy people, the Israel of God (Gal. vi. 16); the privileges of the chosen nation under the Old Covenant being transferred to Christians under the New.—**πιστοῖς**: not to be taken

d iv. 3.
e With εν, Gal. iii. 26; Eph. i. 15; 1 Tim. iii. 13; 2 Tim. iii. 15.
f Objective, Rom. viii. 24; Gal. v. 5; Tit. ii. 13.
g 2 Tim. iv. 8.

3. Εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ Θεῷ πατρὶ[1] τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ[2] πάντοτε [d]περὶ[3] ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι, 4. ἀκούσαντες τὴν [e]πίστιν ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην ἣν ἔχετε[4] εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους, 5. διὰ τὴν [f]ἐλπίδα τὴν [g]ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ἣν

[1] So W.H., R.V. with BC*, possibly by assimilation to **θ. π.** (ver. 2). **και πατρι**: T., Tr. with ℵAC²DᶜKLP, probably to avoid unusual expression. **τω πατρι**: Ln., Ws. with D*FG, Chrys. inserted for similar reason.

[2] So Ws. with B. **Ιησου Χριστου**: Ln., T., Tr. [W.H.], Lft., R.V. with other MSS.

[3] So T., W.H., Lft. with ℵACDᶜKLP. **υπερ**: Ln., Tr., W.H. mg., Ws. with BD*FG 17, probably from ver. 9.

[4] **ην εχετε**: Ln., T., Tr., [W.H.] with ℵACD*FGP 17, possibly conformed to Philm. 5. **την**: Ws. with DᶜKL, perhaps by assimilation to Eph. i. 15; B omits, perhaps rightly.

in the passive sense (as by Ew., Ell., Lightf., Abb., R.V.) = "steadfast," "faithful," with tacit reference to the falling away to false doctrine. Combined with **ἀδελφ.** its meaning would be faithful to Paul, which would have no point here. It should be taken here, as by most commentators, in the sense of "believing". —**ἐν Χριστῷ.** It is significant that **Χριστός** occurs alone very frequently in this Epistle, but **Ἰησοῦς** never (though **Κυρίου ἡμ. Ἰησοῦ**, ver. 3; **Κυρ. Ἰησ.**, iii. 17). No doubt this is to be accounted for by the need for emphasis on the doctrine of the Person of Christ.—**χάρις ὑμῖν κ. εἰρήνη.** This combination is found in all the Epistles that claim to be Paul's except the Pastorals, where it is modified. The formula, which was probably constructed by Paul, combines the Greek and Hebrew forms of salutation.—**ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν.** This is not added in 1 Thess. The other Epistles add **καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.** No importance is to be attached to their omission here. *Cf.* the similarly shortened form **ἡ χάρις μεθ' ὑμῶν** (iv. 18).

Vv. 3-8. PAUL'S THANKSGIVING FOR THE TIDINGS HE HAS RECEIVED OF THE SPIRITUAL WELFARE OF THE COLOSSIANS. According to his usual custom (so in Thess., 1 Cor., Rom., Phil., Philm.), Paul begins his letter with an expression of his thankfulness to God for the Christian graces of his readers. There is, however, a certain conventional element in these greetings, as may be seen from a comparison of similar formulæ in letters found among recently discovered papyri (see articles by Prof. Rendel Harris in *The Expositor* for Sept. and Dec., 1898). Eph. i. 15-17 is parallel to vv. 3, 4 and 9.—Ver. 3. **τῷ Θεῷ πατρὶ κ.τ.λ.**: "to God, the Father of our Lord Jesus". Even if **Θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ** were read, we should probably not make **Κυρίου** dependent on **Θεῷ** as well as **πατρὶ**, since this is not Paul's usual language, though it is found in Eph. i. 17 (**ὁ Θεὸς τ. Κυρ. ἡμ. Ἰ. Χ.**).—**πάντοτε** is connected by several commentators (Beng., Alf., Ell., Findl., R.V.) with **προσευχ.** In favour of this is **οὐ πανόμεθα ὑπ. ὑμ. προσευχ.** (ver. 9). But more probably it should be taken with **εὐχαριστ.** (Mey., Lightf., Ol., Haupt, Weiss, Abb.), as this is the usual collocation in Paul. But **περὶ ὑμῶν** belongs to **προσευχ.**, not (as Lightf., Ol.) to **εὐχαριστ.** "We always give thanks when we pray for you."

Ver. 4. Paul now introduces the grounds of his thankfulness, the good report he has heard as to the faith and love of the Colossians. He refers to it again (ver. 9).—**πίστιν ἐν Χ. ἐν** may be equivalent to **εἰς**, but probably indicates "the sphere in which their faith moves rather than the object to which it is directed" (Lightf.). This faith rests upon Christ. **πίστ.** is wrongly taken by Ewald to mean "fidelity".—**πάντας**, *i.e.*, all Christians throughout the world, whose unity in the universal Church was a thought much in Paul's mind at this time.

Ver. 5. **διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα.** This is connected by Bengel, followed by several recent commentators (Hofm., Kl., Ol., Haupt, Weiss, Abb.), with **εὐχαριστοῦμεν.** Having heard of their faith and love, Paul gives thanks for the hope laid up for them in heaven. Lightfoot and Soden urge that in this way the triad of Christian

[h] προηκούσατε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, 6. τοῦ [i] παρόντος εἰς ὑμᾶς, καθὼς καὶ ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ἔστιν, [k] καρποφορούμενον καὶ αὐξανόμενον καθὼς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας ἠκού-

h Class. only here in Bib. Gk. i With εις, 1 Macc. xi. 63; only here in N.T.; often in class. Gk.; with προς four times in N.T. k Middle only here.

graces, faith, hope and love, is broken up. But "hope" is objective here, not the grace of hope, but the object of that hope. It is true that Paul glides from the subjective to the objective use of **ἐλπίς** in Rom. viii. 24, but if this combination had been intended here he would probably have simply co-ordinated the three terms. A more serious objection is that **εὐχαριστ.** is so far away, though Haupt urges that **διὰ τ. ἐλπ.** could not have come in earlier. Further, Paul never uses this constr. **εὐχαριστ. διὰ.** It is also his custom, at the beginning of his Epistles, to give thanks for the Christian character of his readers (which he hardly does in ver. 4), not for the heavenly reward that awaits them. Others (De W., Lightf., Sod.) connect it with **τ. πίστιν . . . καὶ τ. ἀγάπην.** This gives a good sense, their faith and love have their ground in their hope of reward. But we should have expected the article before a clause thus added to substantives. It is simplest to refer it to **τὴν ἀγ. ἣν ἔχετε** (Chrys., Mey., Ell., Alf., Franke), and interpret it of the love which is due to the hope of a heavenly reward. It is urged that a love of this calculating kind is foreign to Paul, but *cf.* 2 Cor. ix. 6, Gal. vi. 9.—**ἐν τ. οὐρανοῖς.** *Cf.* the reward or treasure in heaven (Matt. v. 12, vi. 20, xix. 21), the citizenship in heaven (Phil. iii. 20), the inheritance reserved in heaven (1 Pet. i. 4).—**ἣν προηκούσατε.** The reference in **προ.** is disputed. Bengel and Klöpper think it means before the writing of this letter; Meyer, Hofmann and Haupt before its fulfilment. But more probably it is to be taken of their first hearing of the Gospel (so Lightf., Ol., Abb.), perhaps in tacit contrast to the false teaching they had recently heard. Haupt, it is true, denies that there is any reference to the false teachers in vv. 2-8; but though none can be proved, it is surely probable that the turn of several expressions should be determined by the subject which was uppermost in the Apostle's mind, and that he should thus prepare his readers for the direct attack.—**λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου.** *Cf.* Eph. i. 13, according to which **τ. εὐαγγ.** should be taken as in apposition to **λόγ. τ. ἀλ.**, "the word of truth, even the Gospel," though it is often explained as the word of truth announced in the Gospel. It is not clear what **λόγ. τ. ἀλ.** means. Several give the genitive an adjectival force, "the true word," but more probably it expresses the content, the word which contains the truth. Perhaps here also there is a side-thrust at the false teachers.

Ver. 6. This word of the truth has been defined as the Gospel, but Paul now proceeds to indicate more precisely what he means by this term. It is that Gospel which they have already received, not the local perversion of it that has recently been urged on their notice, but that which is spreading in the whole world, its truth authenticated by its ever-widening area and deepening influence on its adherents, and which manifests the same inherent energy among the Colossians themselves, in the form in which they learnt it from their teacher Epaphras.—**καθὼς καὶ ἐν παντὶ . . . ἐν ὑμῖν.** According to the *TR.* **καὶ ἔστι,** two statements are made—that the Gospel is present with the Colossians as it is present in all the world, and that it is bearing fruit and increasing as it is among the Colossians. The omission of **καὶ** before **ἐστὶν καρ.** creates a little awkwardness, since **καθὼς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν** seems then superfluous. Lightfoot takes **ἐστ. καρ.** together as a periphrasis for **καρποφορεῖται,** but this construction is very rare in Paul. The symmetry of clauses is much better preserved if, with Soden and Haupt, we write **ἔστιν, καρ.** We thus get the same double comparison as with the *TR.*, Paul passing from the special to the general, and from the general back to the special. For the hyperbole **ἐν π. τ. κόσμῳ,** *cf.* 1 Thess. i. 8, Rom. i. 8, x. 18. As Gess points out (*Christi Person und Werk*, ii., 1, p. 228), Paul wishes here and in ver. 23 to widen the outlook of the Colossians, since the more isolated the community the greater the danger from seducers. For the similar feeling that local idiosyncrasies are to be controlled by the general custom of the Church, *cf.* 1 Cor. xi. 16, xiv. 36 (*cf.* 33).—**καρποφορούμενον καὶ αὐξανόμενον.** The former of these participles expresses

l Only here and iv. 7 in Paul.
m Only here and 1 Cor. i. 11, iii. 13 in Paul.
n Mark xi. 24.
o With acc., Phil. i. 11.

σατε καὶ ἐπέγνωτε τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ· 7. καθὼς ἐμάθετε ἀπὸ Ἐπαφρᾶ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ [1] συνδούλου ἡμῶν, ὅς ἐστιν πιστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν [1] διάκονος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 8. ὁ καὶ [m] δηλώσας ἡμῖν τὴν ὑμῶν ἀγάπην ἐν πνεύματι. 9. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας ἠκούσαμεν, οὐ παυόμεθα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν [n] προσευχόμενοι καὶ αἰτούμενοι,[2] ἵνα [o] πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ

[1] So Ln., Tr., W.H., R.V. with ℵ*ABDFG, possibly under influence of **συνδ. ημ.** and **ημιν** (ver. 8). **υμων**: T., Ws., W.H. mg., R.V. mg. with ℵcCDbKL 17; most vss. probably conformed to **υπερ υμων** (ver. 9) and **τ. υμων αγ.** (ver. 8).

[2] **και αιτουμενοι**: omitted by BK through homœoteleuton.

the inward energy of the Gospel (dynamic middle) in its adherents, the latter its extension in the world by gathering in new converts.—**ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας.** This expresses the further fact that the progress of the Gospel has been continuous from the first in the Colossian Church.—**ἠκούσατε . . . Θεοῦ.** It is uncertain whether **χάριν** is governed by both verbs (so Lightf., Kl., Ol., Sod., Abb.) or by the latter only (so Mey., Ell., Haupt). In the former case **ἠκούσ.** will mean "were instructed in". But it is simpler to translate "ye heard it [*i.e.*, the Gospel] and knew the grace of God". **ἐπέγνωτε** should strictly imply full knowledge, but as the reference is to the time of their conversion it seems doubtful whether this shade of meaning should be pressed. **ἐπίγνωσις** is in his mind. The word occurs twice in the context. The grace of God is probably mentioned in opposition to the false teachers' doctrine of ordinances and rigorous asceticism.—**ἐν ἀληθείᾳ**: not to be taken as if an adjective with **χάριν**, "the true grace of God," for there is no false grace of God, but with **ἐπεγ.** in the sense that they knew the Gospel as it truly is, in its genuine reality, in opposition to the travesty of it recently introduced.

Ver. 7. **καθὼς**, *i.e.*, in the manner in which. Paul thus sets the seal of his approval on the form of the Gospel which they had learnt from their teacher, and also on the teacher himself.—**Ἐπαφρᾶ.** Epaphras was apparently the founder of the Colossian Church, **ἐμάθετε** referring to the same time as **ἠκούσατε.** He had remained in connexion with it (iv. 12), and seems to have come to Paul to inform him of the teaching that was threatening its welfare. He is not to be identified with Epaphroditus (Phil. ii. 25 *sq.*, iv. 18), who was connected with Philippi. The name was common.—**ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν.** This is probably the correct reading; Epaphras is a minister to the Colossians on Paul's behalf, since he has accomplished a task which belonged to Paul's sphere as the Apostle of the Gentiles. The reading **ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν** may be taken in two ways, either (preferably) that he was a minister of Christ for the sake of the Colossians, in which case we should probably have had **ὑμῖν** or **ἐν ὑμῖν** or simply **ὑμῶν**; or that he ministered to Paul as the representative of the Colossians, for which we should have expected "my minister" instead of "minister of Christ".

Ver. 8. **τὴν ὑμῶν ἀγάπην** may be taken in the general sense of ver. 4, though many think it is their love to Paul that is meant; and this is favoured by **δηλ. ἡμ.**, and perhaps by **καὶ ἡμεῖς** in ver. 9. **ἐν πνεύματι** is added to show that this love is in the Holy Spirit.

Vv. 9-14. PAUL'S UNCEASING PRAYER FOR THAT MORAL DISCERNMENT WHICH WILL ENABLE THEM TO PLEASE GOD IN ALL THEIR CONDUCT, THAT STRENGTH WHICH WILL GIVE THEM ENDURANCE IN FACE OF ALL PROVOCATION AND TRIAL, AND THAT THANKFULNESS TO GOD, WHICH BEFITS THE GREAT DELIVERANCE HE HAS ACHIEVED FOR THEM THROUGH HIS SON.—Ver. 9. **διὰ τοῦτο.** The good report from Colossæ prompts Paul's prayer. Apparently the reference is to all that has been said in vv. 4-8, though Haupt confines it to ver. 8.—**καὶ ἡμεῖς**: "we also," *i.e.*, as the Colossians had prayed for Paul, so he had made unceasing prayer for them. Similar assurances are common in the letters of the period, but their conventional character must not in the case of one of so intense a nature as Paul's lead us to degrade them into polite commonplaces. — **προσευχόμενοι καὶ αἰτούμενοι.** The former verb is general, the latter special, referring to

συνέσει πνευματικῇ, 10. περιπατῆσαι ἀξίως τοῦ Κυρίου εἰς πᾶσαν [p] ἀρεσκείαν, ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ καρποφοροῦντες καὶ αὐξανόμενοι τῇ ἐπιγνώσει [1] τοῦ Θεοῦ, 11. ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει [q] δυναμούμενοι κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, εἰς πᾶσαν ὑπομονὴν καὶ μακροθυμίαν

[p] Only here in N.T.; in Philo of pleasing *God*; in bad sense, Theoph., *Char.*, 5; Arist., *Eth. Eud.*, ii., 3; *Pol.*, vi., 2, etc.; Diod., xiii., 53.

[q] Only here, Heb. xi. 34 and (?) Eph. vi. 10 in N.T., or Gk. vss. of O.T. Elsewhere in Paul, *ενδυν.*

[1] So edd. with ℵABCD*EFGP 17. **εις την επιγνωσιν**: D^{c}KL, probably to simplify the constr., perhaps assisted by **την επιγνωσιν** (ver. 9).

the definite request. Soden thinks the middle (**αἰτούμενοι**) is chosen to express Paul's personal interest, but there seems to have been no distinction between the middle and active of this verb in later Greek.—**ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν.** After verbs of praying, etc., **ἵνα** is used in a weakened sense to express the content of the prayer. **πληρ.** with the accusative is not precisely the same as with the genitive or dative. So here "filled with respect to". **ἐπίγνωσις** is stronger than **γνῶσις.** Meyer defines it as the knowledge which grasps and penetrates into the object.—**τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ.** This does not mean God's counsel of redemption (Chrys., Beng., De W., Kl.), nor "the whole counsel of God as made known to us in Christ" (Findl.), but, as the context indicates (ver. 10), the moral aspect of God's will, "His will for the conduct of our lives" (Mey., Sod., Haupt, Abb.).—**ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῇ**: to be taken with the preceding, not (as by Hofm.) with the following words. **σοφία** is general, **σύνεσις** special. **σοφία** embraces the whole range of mental faculties; **σύνεσις** is the special faculty of intelligence or insight which discriminates between the false and the true, and grasps the relations in which things stand to each other. The addition of **πνευμ.** shows that both are to proceed from the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. They thus stand in opposition to fleshly wisdom (2 Cor. i. 12), and especially, it would seem, though Haupt denies this, to the false wisdom, by which the Colossians were in danger of being ensnared (*cf.* **τοῦ νοὸς τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ,** ii. 18). The repetition of **πᾶς** in this context should be noticed. The early part of the Epistle is strongly marked by repetition of particular words and phrases.

Ver. 10. **περιπατῆσαι ἀξίως τοῦ Κυρίου** (*cf.* Eph. iv. 1). This lofty wisdom and insight is not an end in itself. It must issue in right practice. Doctrine and ethics are for Paul inseparable. Right conduct must be founded on right thinking, but right thinking must also lead to right conduct. The infinitive expresses result "so as to walk". **τοῦ Κυρ.,** *i.e.*, of Christ, not of God (Hofm., Ol.). In 1 Thess. ii. 12 **τοῦ Θεοῦ** is used, but **ὁ Κύρ.** in Paul means Christ.—**ἀρεσκείαν** in classical Greek used generally in a bad sense, of obsequiousness. But it often occurs in Philo in a good sense; see the note on the word in Deissmann's *Bible Studies*, p. 224. **καρποφοροῦντες καὶ αὐξανόμενοι:** For the collocation *cf.* ver. 6. The participles should probably be connected with **περιπατῆσαι,** not (as by Beng., Hofm., Weiss) with **πληρωθῆτε,** which is too far away. The continuation of an infinitive by a nominative participle instead of the accusative is frequent in classical Greek, and occurs several times in Paul (ii. 2, iii. 16, Eph. iv. 2, 3). They should not be separated. The whole clause should be translated "bearing fruit and increasing in every good work by the knowledge of God". Fruit bearing is one of Paul's favourite metaphors.—**τῇ ἐπιγνώσει**: not as R.V. and Moule "in the knowledge," for Paul has already spoken of this in ver. 9, but "by the knowledge," the knowledge of God being the means of their spiritual growth. Meyer, against the overwhelming weight of evidence, reads **εἰς τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν,** "as regards the knowledge". This would make knowledge the goal of conduct (*cf.* John vii. 17), whereas previously the relation is reversed.

Ver. 11. **ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει**: "with all power," **ἐν** being instrumental. **κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ.** The equipment with power is proportioned not simply to the recipient's need, but to the Divine supply. God's glory is His manifested nature, here as manifested in might.—**εἰς πᾶσαν ὑπομονὴν καὶ μακροθυμίαν.** This equipment with Divine power is not, as we might have expected, said to be given with a view to deeds

μετὰ χαρᾶς, 12. εὐχαριστοῦντες τῷ [r]πατρὶ τῷ [s]ἱκανώσαντι[1] ὑμᾶς[2] εἰς τὴν [tu]μερίδα τοῦ [uv]κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ φωτί, 13. [v]ὃς ἐρύσατο ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς [w]ἐξουσίας τοῦ σκότους καὶ μετέστησεν εἰς

r Absol., 1 Cor. viii. 6; 2 Cor. vi. 18 (quot.); Rom. vi. 4; Eph. ii. 18; Acts i. 4, 7, ii. 3; 1 John. s LXX; Dion. Hal.; only here and 2 Cor. iii. 6 in N.T. t Only here and 2 Cor. vi. 15; Luke x. 42; Acts viii. 21, xvi. 12 in N.T. u Acts viii. 21. v Acts xxvi. 18. w Luke xxii. 53.

[1] So T., Tr., W.H., R.V. with nearly all ancient authorities. καλεσαντι: D*FG 17, by substitution of more usual word, helped by similarity of the two words. καλεσαντι και ικανωσαντι: Ln., Ws. with B alone, by combination of two readings.

[2] So T., W.H., Ws., Tr. mg., R.V. mg., Lft. mg. with ℵB. ημας: L., Tr., Lft., R.V. with ACDEFGKLP, probably under influence of ημας (ver. 13).

of great spiritual heroism, but for the practice of passive virtues, since this often puts the greater strain on the Christian's strength. ὑπομ. is endurance, steadfastness in face of trials, temptations and persecutions; μακροθ. is forbearance, the patience of spirit which will not retaliate. "The one is opposed to *cowardice* or *despondency*, the other to *wrath* or *revenge*" (Lightf.). There seems to be no reference in μακροθ., as Alford supposes, to their attitude in conflict with error.—μετὰ χαρᾶς: not to be taken (as by Mey., Ell., Hofm., Weiss, Abb.) with εὐχαριστ., which would be tautological and throw a false emphasis on these words, but with ὑπομ. κ. μακροθ. It forms a very necessary addition, for the peculiar danger of the exercise of those qualities is that it tends to produce a certain gloominess or sourness of disposition. The remedy is that the Christian should be so filled with joy that he is able to meet all his trials with a buoyant sense of mastery.

Ver. 12. εὐχαριστοῦντες: not to be taken with οὐ παυόμεθα, ver. 9 (Chrys., Beng.). Usually it is co-ordinated with the two preceding participial clauses. Haupt objects that it would be strange if thankfulness for participation in salvation were mentioned only after its consequences for Christian conduct had been deduced. He thinks it is a more precise development of μετὰ χαρᾶς; joy being produced by our thankful consciousness of the benefits thus secured to us. There is force in this, though the form of expression strongly suggests the common view, and considerations of order should not, perhaps, be so rigidly pressed.—τῷ πατρὶ. The word is selected to emphasise God's Fatherly love as the source of their redemption; though Soden thinks that, as in Rom. vi. 4, Paul has in mind God's relation to Christ (so Alf.).—τῷ ἱκανώσαντι ὑμᾶς: "who qualified you". The reference is to status rather than character.—εἰς τὴν μερίδα . . . φωτί. Lightfoot thinks τ. μερ. τ. κλ. is the portion which consists in the lot, κλήρου being a genitive of apposition (so Sod., Abb.). But probably κλ. is the general inheritance in which each individual has his μέρ. The lot is the blessedness awaiting the saints. More controverted is the connexion of ἐν τῷ φωτί. Meyer connects it with ἱκανώσ. and takes ἐν as instrumental "by the light". This is harsh, and φωτί in contrast to σκότους (ver. 13) cannot mean the Gospel. Others connect it with ἁγίων, either in the sense of angels (so Kl., Franke and Lueken) or saints (so Ol. and others). But the angels are never in the N.T. called οἱ ἅγιοι, though this term is used for them in the O.T. and Jewish Apocalyptic. Further, the contrast with the "darkness" of ver. 13 loses its force unless the "holy ones" are Christians as opposed to non-Christians. And if Paul had meant this he would have expressed himself more plainly. Nor is any such reference probable in an Epistle directed especially against over-valuation of the angels. If saints are meant, unless (with Ol.) we give φωτί merely an ethical sense, they must be saints in heaven, for which we should have expected τῶν ἐν φωτί, as the object of the addition would be to distinguish them from saints on earth. ἐν φωτί should therefore be connected either with μερίδα (Beng.), μερίδα τ. κλήρου (Alf., Lightf.), or κλήρου (De W., Ell., Sod., Haupt). The difference is slight, and it seems simplest to connect with κλ., "the lot of the saints [situated] in the light"; ἐν being probably local, and not expressing, as in Acts viii. 21, the idea of a share in the light. The precise sense of φῶς is disputed. Oltramare takes it of the state of holiness in which Chris-

τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ, 14. ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν[1] τὴν [x] ἀπολύτρωσιν, τὴν [y] ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν· 15. ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ

[x] Plut., *Pomp.*, p. 631 B; Jos., *Ant.*, xii., 2, 3; Philo, *Qu. om. pr. lib.*, § 17; Diod., *Fragm.*, xxxvii., 53; in LXX only Dan. iv. 30; in N.T. ten times.

[1] So edd. (except Ln. ed. min.) with almost all authorities. **εσχομεν**: W.H. mg. with B cop., probably a conformation to aorists of ver. 13.

tians live, so that the distinction between saints on earth and in heaven does not arise. But the immediate impression of the phrase is that the heavenly kingdom, where God dwells in light, is referred to.

Ver. 13. Paul now explains how God has qualified them for their share in the heavenly inheritance. On this passage Acts xxvi. 18 should be compared; the parallels extend to ver. 12, 14 also.—**ἐρύσατο.** The aorist refers to the time of conversion. The metaphor implies the miserable state of those delivered and the struggle necessary to deliver them.—**ἐξουσίας**: "ubi **τῇ βασιλείᾳ** opponitur, est tyrannis" (Wetstein, so also Chrys., Lightf., Kl.). This would heighten the contrast between the power of darkness and the "kingdom of the son of His love". But Abbott argues forcibly against this view, especially with relation to the N.T. usage. He quotes Rev. xii. 10, **ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ**, where the contrast obviously cannot be maintained. Grimm takes the term as a collective expression for the demoniacal powers; and Klöpper says that in Paul **ἐξ.** is not a mere abstract term, but signifies the possessors of power. Here, however, he rightly sees that the contrast to **βασ.** makes this meaning inappropriate, and that for it **ἐρύσ. ἀπό** would have been expected rather than **ἐρύσ. ἐκ.** Accordingly he interprets it as the dominion possessed by the (personified) darkness. — **τοῦ σκότους**: taken by Hofmann as a genitive of apposition, but the obvious interpretation is to take it as a subjective genitive, the dominion which darkness exercises. We should have expected simply "out of darkness" to correspond to "in light," but Paul changes the form, partly to insist that the darkness is not a mere state but exercises an active authority, partly to secure a parallel with the kingdom of God's Son. But we are not justified (with Mey., Kl.) in personifying **σκότος**, for the primary contrast is with **φωτί** not **υἱοῦ.**—**μετέστησεν.** Wetstein quotes Jos., *Ant.*, ix., 11, 1 (Tiglath-Pileser's deportation of N.E. Israel), and Lightfoot thinks that this use of the word suggested the choice of it here, and this is made more probable by the addition of **εἰς τ. βασ.** Meyer, however, quotes a striking parallel from Plato, where no such reference is present: **ἔκ τε φωτὸς εἰς σκότος μεθισταμένων καὶ ἐκ σκότους εἰς φῶς** (*Rep.*, p. 518 A).—**βασιλείαν.** Meyer insists that this is the Messianic kingdom, and as the realisation of this lay in the future to Paul the clause must have a proleptic reference, citizenship in the kingdom being guaranteed by their conversion. But the argument rests on a false premiss, for in 1 Cor. iv. 20, Rom. xiv. 17, the sense is not eschatological. Nor, indeed, can it be so here, for the translation into the kingdom must have taken place at the same time as the deliverance.—**υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ.** Augustine, followed by Olshausen and Lightfoot, takes **ἀγάπης** as a genitive of origin, and interprets, the Son begotten of the essence of the Father, which is love. This has no parallel in the N.T., and rests, as Meyer points out, on a confusion of the metaphysical with the ethical essence of God. The phrase is practically equivalent to His beloved Son, but is chosen for the sake of emphasis to indicate His greatness and the excellence of His kingdom. There is, perhaps, the further thought that the love which rests on the Son must rest also on those who are one with Him.

Ver. 14. This verse is parallel to Eph. i. 7. **ἐν ᾧ**: not by whom, but in whom; if we possess Christ, we possess in Him our deliverance.—**ἔχομεν**: (present) we have as an abiding possession.—**ἀπολύτρωσιν**: "deliverance". The word is generally interpreted as ransom by payment of a price, for which Mark x. 45, **δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν**, may be compared. But it is not certain that the word ever has this meaning. It is very rare in Greek writers (see reff.). The passage from Plutarch refers to pirates holding cities to ransom. But obviously the word here does not mean that we procure release by paying a ransom. The word is often used simply

y So of God, Θεοῦ τοῦ [y] ἀοράτου, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, 16. ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ
1 Tim. i. 17; Heb. ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα [1] ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ [2] ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ [z] ὁρατὰ
xi. 27.
z Only here in N.T.

[1] So Ln., T., Tr., W.H. with ℵ*BD*E*FGP 17, possibly by homœoteleuton. τα: inserted before εν τοις ουρανοις by Ws. (who thinks it indispensable before τα ορατα) with ℵᶜADᶜKL.

[2] So T., W.H., Ws. with ℵ*B. τα: inserted before επι της γης by [Ln.], [Tr.] with ℵᶜACDEFGKLP.

in the sense of "deliverance," the idea of ransom having disappeared. (So in Rom. viii. 23, Eph. iv. 30, Luke xxi. 28.) It is best therefore to translate "deliverance" here, especially as this suits better the definition in the following words. The remission of sins is itself our deliverance, whereas it stands to the payment of the ransom as effect to cause. The elaborate discussion in Oltramare may be referred to for fuller details, with the criticism in Sanday and Headlam's note on Rom. iii. 24; also Abbott on Eph. i. 7; Westcott on Heb., pp. 295, 296; Ritschl, *Rechtf. und Versöhn.* ii., 222 *sq.*—**τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν.** The similar definition of **ἀπολ.** in Eph. i. 7 tells against Lightfoot's view that it is added here against erroneous definitions by the false teachers, who very probably did not employ the term. The precise phrase does not occur elsewhere in Paul. **τ. ἁμ.** depends simply on **τ. ἀφ.**, not, as Hofmann thinks, on it and **τ. ἀπολ.**, for the latter is not used with the object from which deliverance is effected.

Vv. 15-21. This Son in whom we have our deliverance is the manifestation of God, the Lord of the universe, the Creator of all things in heaven and earth, including the angelic powers, and He is the goal for which they have been created. And as He is the first in the universe, so also He is Head of the Church, who has passed to His dominion from the realm of the dead, that He might become first in all things. For the Father willed that in Him all the fulness of Divine grace should dwell, and thus that He should reconcile to Him through His blood all things not on earth only but also in the heavens, in which reconciliation the Colossians have their part.—Ver. 15. With this verse the great Christological passage of the Epistle begins. Its aim is to refute the false doctrine, according to which angelic mediators usurped the place and functions of the Son in nature and grace. He, and He alone, is the Creator, Redeemer and Sovereign of all beings in the universe, including these angelic powers. The passage does not deal with the eternal relations of the Son to the Father, but with the Son's relations to the universe and the Church. It is not of the pre-existent Son that Paul begins to speak, but of the Son who now possesses the kingdom, and in whom we have our deliverance (**ὅς** refers back to **τ. υἱοῦ ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τ. ἀπολύτρωσιν**). The work of the Son in His pre-existent state is referred to, that the true position of the exalted Christ may be rightly understood. As in other great theological passages in the Pauline Epistles, the metaphysical element is introduced for the sake of the practical. But it would be absurd to infer from this that it had little importance for the Apostle himself. He assumes the pre-existence of the Son as common ground, and is thus applying a fundamental Christian truth, which would form part of the elementary instruction in his Churches, to a new form of false teaching.—**ὅς ἐστιν.** It is the exalted Christ of whom Paul is speaking, as is suggested, though not necessarily implied by the present, but more forcibly by the previous relative clause. We could not feel confident in arguing back from the function of the exalted Son to be **εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ** to that of the pre-incarnate Son, but what would be a plausible inference from this passage is asserted in Phil. ii. 5.—**εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου.** As image of God the Son possesses such likeness to God as fits Him to be the manifestation of God to us. God is invisible, which does not merely mean that He cannot be seen by our bodily eye, but that He is unknowable. In the exalted Christ the unknowable God becomes known. We behold "with unveiled face the glory of the Lord," and so "are changed into the same image" (2 Cor. iii. 18), God has "shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge

of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (iv. 6), and it is the unbelieving on whom "the light of the Gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God," does not shine (iv. 4). These passages illustrate Paul's language here, and show that it is not, as Oltramare argues, of physical visibility or invisibility that he is speaking. Christ is the image of God for Christians. This, it is true, is only part of His wider functions. The Son is the Mediator between God and the universe. His work in grace has its basis in His place and work in nature. But it is the aspect of His work of which Paul is here speaking. The view of some of the Fathers that the Son, as image of the invisible God, must be Himself invisible is precisely the opposite of that intended by Paul. — **πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως.** **πρωτότοκος** in its primary sense expresses temporal priority, and then, on account of the privileges of the firstborn, it gains the further sense of dominion. Many commentators think both ideas are present here. Soden and Abbott, on the other hand, deny that the word expresses anything more than priority to and distinction from all creation, while Haupt again thinks that all the stress is on the idea of dominion, the Son is ruler of all creation (similarly Ol. and Weiss, who says that no temporal *prius* lies in the expression). It is undeniable that the word in the O.T. had in some cases lost its temporal significance, *e.g.*, Exod. iv. 22, Ps. lxxxix. 28. Schoettgen instances the fact that R. Bechai spoke of God as "the firstborn of the world," though, probably, as Bleek says in his note on Heb. i. 6, this is to be regarded "nur als eine Singularität". The course of the argument seems to require that the stress should lie on the lordship of the Son rather than on His priority to creation. For what Paul is concerned to prove is the superiority of Christ to the angels, and for this the idea of priority is not relevant, but that of dominion is. Whether the word retains anything of its original meaning here is doubtful. If so, it might seem most natural to argue with the Arians that the Son is regarded as a creature. Grammatically it is possible to make **πάσης κτίσεως** a partitive genitive. But this is excluded by the context, which sharply distinguishes between the Son and **τὰ πάντα**, and for this idea Paul would probably have used **πρωτόκτιστος**. The genitive is therefore commonly explained as a genitive of comparison. Oltramare says that such a genitive after a substantive is a pure invention, but it is explained to be after the **προ** or **πρωτο** in **πρωτότοκος** (*cf.* John i. 15, **ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν**). This, as Lightfoot says, "unduly strains the grammar," and on this account it seems best to exclude the temporal element altogether. The pre-existence is sufficiently asserted in what follows. There seems to be no real affinity with Philo's doctrine of the Logos as **πρωτόγονος.**—**πάσης κτίσεως** may be taken either as a collective, "all creation" (Lightf., R.V.), or distributively, "every creature" (Mey., Ell., Haupt, Abb.). Lightfoot urges in favour of the former that **πρωτότ.** "seems to require either a collective noun or a plural". But if **πρωτότ.** be taken in the sense of ruler, this is not so; and Haupt points out that **πᾶσα κτίσις** elsewhere is used of every created thing, and that Paul uses **κτίσις** without the article in the sense of creature. It is accordingly best to take it so here, "firstborn of every creature". A further question is raised as to what the term includes. Haupt thinks its sense is limited to spiritual beings, since (1) Paul is proving the superiority of Christ to the angels, (2) he defines by **τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς** not including heaven and earth themselves, (3) **εἰς αὐτὸν** shows that animate creatures must be referred to. At the same time he is careful to point out that, according to Jewish ideas, shared, no doubt, by the false teachers, the heavenly bodies were regarded as possessed of souls and as standing in the closest relation to the spirit world. This, combined with the fact that all material things were supposed similarly to have guardian spirits, rather tells against his limitation. For Paul really was concerned to show not only that Christ was superior to the angels, but that He and not the angels was Lord of the material creation. The phrase should therefore be taken in its full sense, though probably it is the spiritual side of the universe that he has chiefly in mind. The interpretation of creation as the new creation, adopted by many Fathers to meet the Arian inference that the Son was a creature, scarcely needs refutation. It would have no point against the false teaching at Colossæ, nor can it be carried through the passage, ver. 16 being decisive against it. Paul would probably have said firstborn of the Church or of the new creation if he had meant this.

Ver. 16. Paul now gives the ground for the designation of the Son as **πρωτότ. π. κτίσεως.** In Him **τὰ πάντα** were created. From this it follows that the Son cannot be a creature, for creation

a *Test. Lev.*; only here in N.T. καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα, εἴτε [a]θρόνοι εἴτε [b]κυριότητες εἴτε [c]ἀρχαὶ εἴτε [c]ἐξουσίαι, τὰ πάντα [d]δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ [e]εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται, 17. καὶ

b Eph. i. 21; 2 Pet. ii. 10; Jude 8. c ii. 10, 15; 1 Cor. xv. 24; Eph. i. 21, iii. 10, vi. 12; Tit. iii. 1; ἄγγελοι with ἀρχαι, Rom. viii. 38 with ἐξουσιαι; 1 Pet. iii. 22. d 1 Cor. viii. 6; John i. 3; Heb. i. 2; of God, Rom. xi. 36; Heb. ii. 10. e Of the Son, only here; of God, Rom. xi. 36; 1 Cor. viii. 6.

is exhausted by the "all things" which were so created in Him ("omnem excludit creaturam," Bengel).—**ἐν αὐτῷ**: this does not mean "by Him". The sense is disputed. The schoolmen, followed by some modern theologians, explain that the Son is the archetype of the universe, the **κόσμος νοητός**, the eternal pattern after which the physical universe has been created. So Philo held that the Logos was the home wherein the eternal ideas resided. But it is by no means clear that Alexandrian influence can be traced in the Epistle. Further, the notion of creation is not suitable to the origin of the ideal universe in the Son. If the Son was from eternity the archetype of the universe, then **ἐκτίσθη ἐν αὐτῷ** ought not to have been used, both because the aorist points to a definite time and the idea of creation is itself inapplicable. But that the ideal universe was at some time created in the Son is an highly improbable, if it is even an intelligible, idea. Again, the sense of **ἐκτίσθη** is controlled by that of **κτίσις**, which does not refer to the ideal universe. It must therefore refer to the actual creation of the universe. If Paul had intended to speak of the realisation in creation of the ideal universe which had in the Son its eternal home he would have said **ἐξ αὐτοῦ**. Others (Mey., Ell., Moule) take **ἐν αὐτῷ** to mean simply that the act of creation depended causally on the Son. This is perhaps the safest explanation, for Haupt's interpretation that apart from His Person there would have been no creation, but with His Person creation was a necessity—in other words, that creation was "given" in Christ—seems with the aorist and the choice of the word **ἐκτίσθη** to be inconsistent with the eternal existence of the Son.—**τὰ πάντα**, *i.e.*, the universe in its widest sense regarded as a collective whole.—**ἐν τ. οὐρανοῖς κ. ἐπὶ τ. γῆς.** As Lightfoot points out, "a classification by locality," while **τὰ ὁρατὰ κ. τ. ἀόρατα** is a "classification by essence". The two do not precisely correspond, for the divisions cross each other to some extent, though some confine the things in heaven to the world of spirits, and the things on earth to the world of men, in which case they would correspond to things invisible and things visible. Against this see above on **π. κτίσεως.**—**εἴτε θρόνοι κ.τ.λ.** This is not an exhaustive definition of **τὰ πάντα**, for Paul selects for mention those creatures to whom worship was paid by the false teachers. The names, as in similar lists, denote angels and not earthly powers. For some of them occur in Jewish angelology, and a reference to earthly dignities would be irrelevant to the polemical purpose of the passage. These angels, Paul insists, so far from being superior or equal to Christ, were as inferior to Him as the creature is to the Creator. They owed their very existence to Him, and could not therefore be allowed for one moment to usurp His place. Lightfoot thinks that Paul is expressing no opinion as to their objective existence, but is simply repeating subjective opinions; and that both here and in ii. 18 he shows a "spirit of impatience with this elaborate angelology". But in face of the detailed proof that he accepted the doctrine of various orders of angels (given most fully by Everling), this cannot be maintained, nor is there any polemical reference in Eph. i. 21. It may be questioned whether any inference can be drawn as to the order of the ranks of angels. The order in the parallel list, Eph. i. 21, is **ἀρχή, ἐξουσία, δύναμις, κυριότης**, on which Godet remarks that in Col. the question is of creation by Christ from whom all proceed, hence the enumeration descends; but in Eph. of the ascension of the risen Christ above all orders, hence the enumeration ascends. But it must be urged against this not merely that only three out of the four titles coincide, but that the order is not fully inverted. Possibly Paul employs here the order of the false teachers (so Kl.). The order apparently descends, but it is questionable if this is intentional, for if the highest orders were inferior to Christ, *a fortiori* the lower would be. **θρόνοι**: taken by some to be the angels of the throne, that is angels who, like the cherubim, bear the throne of God. But it is more probable that they are those seated on thrones (*cf.* Rev. iv. 4). On these orders, *cf.* the *Slavonic Enoch*,

xx., 1. In the seventh heaven Enoch saw "a very great light and all the fiery hosts of great archangels, and incorporeal powers and *lordships and principalities and powers;* cherubim and seraphim, *thrones* and the watchfulness of many eyes". Also *Enoch*, lxi., 10, "and all the angels of *powers* and all the angels of *principalities*". *Test.*, xii., *Patr. Levi.*, 3, **ἐν δὲ τῷ μετ' αὐτόν εἰσι θρόνοι, ἐξουσίαι, ἐν ᾧ ὕμνοι ἀεὶ τῷ Θεῷ προσφέρονται.**—**κυριότητες**: apparently inferior to **θρόνοι.**—**ἀρχαὶ . . . ἐξουσίαι** usually occur together and in this order.—**τὰ πάντα . . . συνέστηκεν**: thrown in as a parenthesis.—**δι' αὐτοῦ.** The Son is the Agent in creation (*cf.* 1 Cor. viii. 6); this definitely states the pre-existence of the Son and assumes the supremacy of the Father, whose Agent the Son is.—**εἰς αὐτὸν.** That the Son is the goal of creation is an advance on Paul's previous teaching, which had been that the goal of the universe is God (Rom. xi. 36; *cf.* 1 Cor. viii. 6, **ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν**). It is urged by Holtzmann and others as decisive against the authenticity of the Epistle as it stands. But in 1 Cor. xv. 25 *sq.* all things have to become subject to the Son before He hands over the kingdom to the Father. We find the same thought in Matt. xxviii. 18 and Heb. ii. 8. And, as Oltramare and others point out, in 1 Cor. viii. 6, **δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα** is said of Christ, but of God in Rom. xi. 36. Yet this difference is not quoted to show that Romans and Corinthians cannot be by the same hand, and it is equally illegitimate to press **εἰς αὐτ.** as inconsistent with Pauline authorship. —**ἔκτισται.** The perfect, as distinct from the aorist, expresses the abiding result as distinct from the act at a definite point of time (*cf.* John i. 3, **ἐγένετο** followed by **γέγονεν**).

Ver. 17. **αὐτός ἐστιν. αὐτ.** is emphatic, He and no other. Lightfoot (followed by Westcott and Hort and Ellicott) accents **ἔστιν,** "He exists," on account of the present, and compares **ἐγὼ εἰμί** (John viii. 58). But there **ἐγὼ εἰμί** stands alone, whereas here **αὐτ. ἐστ.** is completed by **πρὸ πάντων.** Besides, there is no object in the assertion of the existence of the Son here. The sense of **ἐστὶν** depends to some extent on that of **πρὸ πάντων.** If, as is usual, **πρὸ** is taken here as temporal, **αὐτός** will be the pre-incarnate Son. If, however, with Haupt, it be taken to assert superiority in rank, **αὐτός** will be the exalted Christ, and the present will be quite regular. It is urged that for this some other preposition, such as **ἐπὶ** or **ὑπέρ,** would have been expected. Gess says that in each of the eleven other passages in which it occurs in Paul it is temporal, and in the other N.T. passages (37) it is used of place or, as generally, of time, except in Jas. v. 12, 1 Pet. iv. 8, where it is used of rank. It is used, however, in classical Greek in this latter sense. Perhaps it is safest to allow the general Pauline usage to determine the sense here. In this case **πρὸ** is temporal and **ἐστιν** a timeless present. **πάντων** is, of course, neuter, like **τὰ πάντα,** not masculine.—**συνέστηκεν**: "hold together". The Son is the centre of unity for the universe. He keeps all its parts in their proper place and due relations and combines them into an ordered whole. Apart from Him it would go to pieces. Philo ascribes a similar function to the Logos. Haupt thinks that this thought that Christ is the principle of coherence for the universe is not in the passage, which means no more than that He sustains it (*cf.* Heb. i. 3, **φέρων τὰ πάντα**).

The interpretation of vv. 15-17 given by Oltramare should not be passed over. He eliminates the idea of pre-existence from the passage, and says that the reference is throughout to Christ as Redeemer. God had in creation to provide by a plan of Redemption for the entrance of evil into the universe, and only on that condition could it take place. So since Christ is the Redeemer, creation is based upon Him, He is the means to it, and the end which it contemplates. He objects to the common view on the following grounds: (1) Elsewhere Paul speaks of God, not Christ, as the Creator and goal of the universe; (2) Paul starts from the Christ in whom we have redemption as **πρωτότ. π. κτίσεως,** and in ver. 18, which refers to the same Person as ver. 17, He is spoken of as the Head of the Church, therefore the context is against any reference to a pre-incarnate Christ; (3) He carefully avoids saying that the Son has created all things, though he has to change the subject of the sentence. In reply to (1) it may be said that the Son acts as Agent of the Father, and so creation may be referred to either, and that while Paul contemplates the final surrender by the Son of the kingdom to the Father, he also contemplates a prior subjection of everything to the Son. Oltramare himself, for another purpose, points to apparent inconsistency in John (John i. 2 compared with Rev. iii. 14, iv. 11, x. 6) and the author of Hebrews

αὐτός ἐστιν πρὸ πάντων καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ [f] συνέστηκεν, 18. καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος τῆς ἐκκλησίας· ὅς ἐστιν ἀρχή,[1] πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸς [g] πρωτεύων,

f Plato, *Rep.*, 530 A; Arist., *de Mun.*, vi., 471; Philo, *de Plant.*, *Noe* 2, *Quis rer. div. haer.* 12.

g Class.; LXX; only here in N.T.; *cf.* φιλοπρωτ., 3 John 9.

[1] So Ln., T., Tr., Lft., Ws. with nearly all ancient authorities. η αρχη: [W.H.] with B 47, under influence of εστιν η κεφαλη.

(i. 2 compared with ii. 10, xi. 3). If these writers did not find the two views incompatible, why should Paul have done so? In reply to (2) it may be urged that Paul's hold on the personal identity of the Son in the states through which He passed was strong enough to enable Him to glide from one to the other without any sense of incongruity. As to (3), the change in the form of sentence is probably to prepare for **δι' αὐτοῦ κ. εἰς αὐτόν.** There is a similar change at ver. 19, where **ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ** corresponds to **ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ** (ver. 16). His own view is open to fatal objections. It is not clear that the creation of the angels who did not fall would be conditional on provision being made for Redemption, nor yet how this would prove the superiority of the Redeemer to these angels. The insuperable difficulty, however, is that the thought is so far-fetched and not naturally suggested by the words. **ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα** can hardly be consistent with the creation of the universe long before the Son came into existence. Nor can **δι' αὐτοῦ** mean merely that the Son was an indispensable condition for the creation of the universe, it implies active agency. Nor is any adequate explanation of **τ. πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν** given. Besides, Phil. ii. 5-8 sufficiently proves that Paul believed in the pre-existence of Christ, and that makes it less than ever justifiable to take the passage in other than its plain sense. —Gess, it may be added, explains that the firstborn is the one who opens for those who follow the path of life, and by his consecration to God must purchase for them the Divine good pleasure. Exod. xiii. 2, 12 *sq.* and Num. iii. 12 *sq.* are quoted to prove this, but neither says anything of the purchase of Divine favour for those born after. Exod. iv. 22 and Ps. lxxxix. 27 are explained to mean, accordingly, that Israel and David, not the nations and their kings, are objects of God's good pleasure and mediators of it to the world. **πρωτότ. π. κτ.** is therefore explained as the opener of the path of life and mediator of God's love to every creature. But this is to overlook the fact that in Ps. lxxxix. the firstborn is further defined as the highest of the kings of the earth.

Ver. 18. The false teachers not only wrongly represented the relation of the angel powers to the universe, but they assigned them a false position in the work of redemption and a false relation to the Church. Hence Paul passes from the pre-eminence of the Son in the universe to speak of Him as Head of the Body. He is thus supreme alike in the universe and the Church.—**ἡ κεφαλὴ τ. σώματος** (*cf.* ii. 19, Eph. i. 22, 23, iv. 15, 16, v. 23). For Christ as Head simply, *cf.* 1 Cor. xi. 3. For the Church as the body of Christ, ver. 24, Eph. iv. 2, 1 Cor. xii. 27, Rom. xii. 5. For Christians as the members of Christ's body, Eph. v. 30, 1 Cor. xii. 37. For Christians as "severally members one of another," Rom. xii. 5. By this metaphor of "the head of the body" is meant that Christ is the Lord and Ruler of His Church, its directing brain, probably also that its life depends on continued union with Him. The Church is a body in the sense that it is a living organism, composed of members vitally united to each other, each member with his own place and function, each essential to the body's perfect health, each dependent on the rest of the body for its life and well-being, while the whole organism and all the individual members derive all their life from the Head and act under His guidance. And as the body needs the Head, to be the source of its life and the controller of its activities, and to unify the members into an organic whole, so the Head needs the body to be His instrument in carrying out His designs. It is only in Colossians and Ephesians that Christ appears as Head of the Church, but the emphasis in Colossians is on the Headship, in Ephesians on the Church.—**τῆς ἐκκλησίας**: often taken as in apposition to **σώματος.** For this we should have expected **τ. σώμ. αὐτοῦ, τ. ἐκκλ.** (*cf.* ver. 24). It may also be taken as epexegetical of **σώματος** (so Weiss and Haupt, who quotes 1 Cor. v. 8, 2 Cor. v. 5, Rom. iv. 11, viii. 21, xv. 16

19. ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι, 20. καὶ δι' [h] αὐτοῦ [h] ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν, [i] εἰρηνοποιήσας διὰ τοῦ

[h] Only here, ver. 21, and Eph. ii. 16 in class.

or Bib. Gk. Elsewhere in Paul καταλ., but Rom. v. 10 (*bis*); 1 Cor. vii. 11; 2 Cor. v. 18-20 (*ter*) only. [i] Prov. x. 10; Hermes in Stob.; only here in N.T.

as parallels, all of which, however, are not clear). **ἐκκλ.** is here the universal Church.—**ὅς ἐστιν**: inasmuch as He is. Paul is giving a reason for the position of the Son as **ἡ κεφ. τ. σώματος.**—**ἀρχή** is not to be taken in the sense of **ἀπαρχή**, nor is it certain that it has, as Lightfoot and others think, the sense of originating power. It is defined by **πρωτότ. ἐκ τ. νεκρῶν**, and this seems to throw the stress rather on the idea of supremacy than that of priority. There is perhaps a tacit reference to **ἀρχαὶ** (ver. 16).—**πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν**: "firstborn from among the dead". In Rev. i. 5 we have **ὁ πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν**, which expresses a different idea. If the temporal reference in **πρ.** is the more prominent, the meaning will be that He is the first to pass out of the dominion of death. But if sovereignty is the leading idea, the meaning is that from among the dead He has passed to His throne, where He reigns as the living Lord, who has overcome death, and who, before He surrenders the kingdom to the Father, will abolish it.—**ἵνα . . . πρωτεύων**: the purpose for which He is **ἀρχή, πρωτότ. ἐκ τ. νεκρῶν.** He is supreme in the universe. He has to become supreme in relation to the Church. **αὐτὸς** is emphatic; **ἐν πᾶσιν** neuter not masculine, on account of the context.

Ver. 19. This verse with ver. 20 shows how the Son was able to hold the position assigned to Him in ver. 18. Further, this verse leads up to ver. 20. The thought is then: All the fulness dwelt in the Son, therefore reconciliation could be accomplished through the blood of His cross, and so He became the Head of the body.—**εὐδόκησεν.** Three views are taken as to the subject of the verb. (1) Meyer, Alford, Lightfoot, Oltramare, Haupt and the great majority of commentators supply **ὁ Θεός** as the subject. (2) Ewald, Ellicott, Weiss, Soden and Abbott make **πλήρωμα** the subject. (3) Conybeare, Hofmann and Findlay supply **ὁ υἱός** or **ὁ Χριστός.** In favour of (3) the unique emphasis on the sovereignty of Christ in this passage is urged, also that it prepares the way for the reference of **ἀποκαταλλάξαι** and **εἰρηνοποιήσας** to Christ, in accordance with Eph. ii. 14-16, v. 27. It is also true that the subject from ver. 15 is, for the most part, the Son. But the usage of Paul leads us to think of the Father, not of the Son, as the One who forms the eternal purpose (Eph. i. 9, 2 Cor. v. 19). Nor does ver. 20 run on naturally. If the Son is the subject of "was well pleased," the obvious interpretation of **δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκ.** is to reconcile through the fulness, which is highly improbable. We should accordingly have to give to **δι' αὐτοῦ** a reflexive sense, and translate "through Himself," which is grammatically possible, but not natural. There is the further objection which it shares with (1) that a change of subjects to the infinitives is required, **πλήρωμα** being the subject of **κατοικ.**, while that to **ἀποκατ.** is **Θεός** or **υἱός.** But it is less awkward in (1) than in (3), for the former does not make the Son at once the originator and the Agent of the plan of reconciliation. Against (1), besides the objection just mentioned, it may be said that the construction with **εὐδόκ.** is unusual, for its subject is elsewhere in the N.T. the subject of the following infinitive (this tells against (3) also), and that in a passage of such importance the subject could not have been omitted. But for the omission of the subject Lightfoot compares Jas. i. 12, iv. 6. What, however, is really decisive in its favour is the difficulty of accepting (2). The expression "all the fulness was well pleased" is very strange in itself. But what is much stranger is that the fulness was not only pleased to dwell in Him, but through Him to reconcile all things unto Him. And the only natural course is to refer **εἰρνηνοπ.** to the subject of **εὐδόκ.**, but the masculine makes it difficult to regard **πλήρ.** as that subject. We should therefore translate "God" [or "the Father"] "was well pleased".—**πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα.** On **πλήρωμα** the detached note in Lightfoot, pp. 255-271, should be consulted, with the criticism of it in an article on "The Church as the Fulfilment of the Christ," by Prof. J. Armitage Robinson (*Expositor*, April, 1898), also Oltramare's note. Lightfoot urges in opposition to Fritzsche that **πλήρωμα** has always a genuinely passive sense, not the pseudo-passive sense "id quo res impletur" which Fritzsche gave

αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ, δι' αὐτοῦ[1] εἴτε τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἴτε τὰ
ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, 21. καὶ ὑμᾶς ποτὲ ὄντας [k]ἀπηλλοτριωμένους καὶ

k Several times in LXX; only here and Eph. ii. 12, iv. 18 in N.T.

[1] So T. [W.H.], Lft., R.V., Ws. with ℵACDbcEKP. δι' αυτου: omitted by Ln., Tr. with BD*FGL, by homœoteleuton.

it, and which is really the active "id quod implet," but that which is completed. The basis of the decision is that substantives in **-μα**, since they are derived from the perfect passive, must have a passive sense. But, as Prof. Robinson points out, these substantives have their stem not in **-μα** but in **-ματ**, and therefore are not to be connected with the perfect passive. He reaches the conclusion that if a general signification is to be sought for, we may say that these nouns represent "the *result* of the agency of the corresponding verb". If the verb is intransitive the substantive will be so; if it is transitive and the substantive corresponds to its object the noun is passive, but if the substantive is followed by the object of the verb in the genitive it is active. According to the double use of **πληροῦν** to "fill" and to "fulfil," **πλήρωμα** may mean that which fills or that which fulfils, the fulness, fulfilment or complement. Oltramare comes to the conclusion that the word means perfection, and interprets this passage to mean that ideal perfection dwelt in Christ. Accordingly he escapes the question what genitive should be supplied after it. It does not seem, however, that the word meant moral perfection. Many think that **θεότητος** should be supplied after **πλήρωμα**, as is actually done in ii. 9. Serious difficulties beset this view. If we think of the eternal indwelling, we make it dependent on the Father's will, an Arian view, which Paul surely did not hold. Alford's reply to this (endorsed by Abbott) that all that is the Son's right "is His Father's pleasure, and is ever referred to that pleasure by Himself," is anything but cogent, for **εὐδόκησεν** refers to a definite decree of the Father, and the obvious meaning of the words is that it lay within the Father's choice whether the **πλήρωμα** should dwell in the Son or not. It might refer to the exaltation of Christ, in which the Son resumed that of which He had emptied Himself in the Incarnation. This would follow the reference to the resurrection in ver. 18. But the order does not indicate the true logical or chronological sequence. Vv. 19, 20 give the ground (**ὅτι**) on which the Son's universal pre-eminence rests, and ver. 20 is quite incompatible with this reference to the exalted state, co-ordinated as **κατοικ.** and **ἀποκατ.** are by **καὶ**. But neither does it suit the incarnate state, which was a state of self-emptying and beggary; even if we could attach any very definite meaning to the words that in the Incarnate Son the Father was pleased that all the fulness of the Godhead should dwell. We should, therefore, probably reject the view that **τὸ πλήρωμα** means the fulness of the Godhead. Since the co-ordinate clause speaks of reconciliation through the blood of the cross, it seems probable that we should regard ver. 19 as asserting such an indwelling as made this possible. We should therefore with Meyer explain **τὸ πλ.** as the fulness of grace, "the whole *charismatic riches of God*" (so also De W., Eadie, Alf., Findl.). Haupt thinks that the full content of the Divine nature is referred to, but with special reference to the Divine grace, and so far he agrees with Meyer. We should also, with Meyer, interpret the indwelling as having reference to the sending of the Son in the incarnation. The Father was pleased that He should come "with the *whole treasure* of *Divine grace*". Thus equipped His death procured reconciliation. Gess takes it similarly, though he thinks, on the whole, that a gradual process is referred to. Findlay's modification of this in favour of a reference to the Ascension (for which he compares Eph. i. 20-23) must be rejected on the grounds mentioned above. The decree of the Father may be supra-temporal, as Haupt thinks, the aorist being used as in Rom. viii. 29, though it is more obvious to take it as referring to the time when He was sent. Two other interpretations of **τὸ πλ.** may be mentioned. Theodoret and other Fathers, followed by some moderns, have explained it to mean the Church. But the indwelling of the **πλ.** prepares the way for the reconciliation, in consequence of which the Church first becomes possible. Nor could **πλ.** by itself mean this; in Eph. i. 22 the reference is supplied by

the context. More possible is the view that it means the universe = **τὰ πάντα**, ver. 16 (Hofm., Cremer, Godet, who compares "the earth is the Lord's and the fulness of it"). In that case the genitive supplied would be **τῶν πάντων** from ver. 20. But if the reference in this be to the summing up of all things in Christ (Eph. i. 10), it is excluded by the fact that the indwelling of the fulness is contemporaneous with the incarnate state. A more plausible interpretation would be to regard **τὰ πάντα** as dwelling in Christ before His death, and by sharing that death, attaining reconciliation with God. This would be an extension of the Pauline thought that all men died when Christ died (2 Cor. v. 14). But it would be an extension precisely corresponding to that of the scope of redemption in ver. 20, for which, indeed, it would admirably prepare the way, the universe dwelling in the Son that His death might be universal in its effects. That the Son is not only Head of the race, but Head also of the universe, is a familiar thought in these Epistles, and as His acts are valid for the one so also for the other. Nothing more is implied for the relation of the universe to Christ than of the race, and if the main stress be thrown on angels and men, there is nothing incongruous in the idea. Whether Paul would have used it in this sense without fuller explanation is uncertain; but in any case a genitive has to be supplied. A further question must be briefly referred to, that of the origin of the term. Several scholars think it was already in use as a technical term of the false teachers at the time when the letter was written. This is possible, and in its favour is its absolute use here; but, if so, it is strange that Paul should use it with such different applications. It is more probable that its origin is due to him.—**κατοικῆσαι.** The word expresses permanent abode as opposed to a temporary sojourn. Bengel says aptly "Haec inhabitatio est fundamentum reconciliationis".

Ver. 20. To this verse Eph. i. 10, ii. 16, are partially parallel. It supplies the basis for the Son's pre-eminence (ver. 18) in His reconciling death.—**δι' αὐτοῦ**: through the Son.—**ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν.** The choice of **ἀποκατ.** instead of the more usual **καταλλ.** is for the sake of strengthening the idea, and by insisting on the completeness of the reconciliation accomplished to exclude all thought that reconciliation by angels is needed to supplement that made by Christ. The reconciliation implies previous estrangement. It is the universal sweep of this passage that makes it at once fascinating and mysterious. Numerous expedients have been devised by exegetes to avoid the plain meaning of the words. The natural sense is that this reconciliation embraces the whole universe, and affects both things in heaven and things on the earth, and that peace is made between them and God (or Christ). The point which creates difficulty is the assertion that angels were thus reconciled. Some have evaded this by interpreting **τὰ πάντα** of the things in heaven below the angels and those on earth below man. It might be possible to parallel the latter reconciliation with Paul's prophecy of the deliverance of animate and inanimate nature (excluding man) from the bondage of corruption (Rom. viii. 19-23). But the two are not identical, for one is and the other is not eschatological, and reconciliation is not deliverance from the bondage of corruption. And this helps us little to explain what the reconciliation of all things in heaven is. Nor is any such limitation legitimate; on the contrary, it is precisely in the opposite direction that any limitation would have to be made; for in its full sense reconciliation can only be of beings endowed with moral and spiritual nature. In vv. 16, 17 angelic powers are explicitly included in **τὰ πάντα.** It is plain that **εἰς αὐτὸν** excludes the view that a reconciliation of angels and men is intended. This is so even if with Chrysostom and others (including apparently Abbott) we make **τὰ ἐπὶ τ. γῆς** and **τὰ ἐν τ. οὐραν.** depend on **εἰρηνοπ.** For this still leaves unexplained **ἀποκ. τ. πάντα εἰς αὐτόν,** which makes the reference to angels undeniable. Bengel's note, "Certum est angelos, Dei amicos, fuisse inimicos hominum Deo infensorum," may be perfectly true. But it is irrelevant here, for only by forcing the words can **εἰρηνοπ . . . οὐραν.** be regarded as other than epexegetical of the preceding clause, and in particular **τ. ἐπὶ τ. γῆς** and **τὰ ἐν τ. οὐραν.** as a resolution of **τ. πάντα.** Abbott's suggestion that **τὰ ἐν. τ. οὐραν.** may be inhabitants of other worlds may be true, though for Paul the thought is far-fetched, but does nothing towards excluding the angels. He urges that **ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς** is not necessarily equivalent to "in heaven". But not only did Jewish angelology place the angels in the heavens, but Paul did so too, and has done so only just before in this passage, defining **τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐραν.** as the various orders of angels (ver. 16).

ἐχθροὺς τῇ διανοίᾳ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς πονηροῖς. 22. νυνὶ δὲ ἀπο-
κατηλλάγητε[1] ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου,[2]
παραστῆσαι ὑμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους καὶ [1]ἀνεγκλήτους κατενώπιον

[1] Only here and 1 Cor. i. 8; 1 Tim. iii. 10; Tit. i. 6, 7 in N.T.

[1] So Ln., Tr. mg., W.H. mg., R.V. mg., Lft., Ws. with B. **αποκατηλλακηται**: 17, a corruption from the text. **αποκατηλλαγεντες**: D*FG, Latin d, e, g, m, Goth., Iren. (transl.) and others, an incorrect correction of text to improve the grammar. **αποκατηλλαξεν**: T., Tr., W.H., R.V. with all other authorities, an alteration for the sake of smoothness, helped by active in ver. 20.

[2] So T., Tr., W.H., R.V., Ws. with most authorities. **αυτου**: inserted after **θανατου** [Ln.], [Lft.] with ℵAP.

Further, not only is this exclusion of the angels from the scope of reconciliation inconsistent with the terms of the passage, it omits a very important point in Paul's polemic. To the angels the false teachers probably ascribed the function of procuring the reconciliation of men with God. (*Cf.* Enoch xv. 2, "And go, say to the watchers of heaven, who have sent thee to intercede for them: you should intercede for men, and not men for you".) How effective is Paul's reply that these angels needed reconciliation themselves! Assuming, then, that angels are included among those reconciled, and that this is also referred to in the words "having made peace through the blood of His cross," the question arises, What did Paul mean by this? Meyer says that in consequence of the fall of the evil angels the angelic order as a whole was affected by the hostile relation of God to them, and the original relation will be fully restored when the evil angels are finally cast into hell. But apart from the speculative nature of this explanation, and the injustice it imputes to God, the reference is certainly not eschatological. Godet lays stress on **εἰς αὐτὸν**, and suggests that the reconciliation is not to God but with reference to God. He thinks that the passing over of sins by God (Rom. iii. 25) might cause the angels, who had been mediators in the giving of the law, difficulties as to the Divine righteousness. This was met and removed by the cross, which revealed God's attitude to sin and reconciled them to His government. We do not know that the angels needed this vindication, which, of course, it was a function of Christ's death to give, though it is possible (Eph. iii. 10, 1 Pet. i. 12). But this interpretation seems to be excluded by the explanation of reconciliation as making peace. And **εἰς αὐτὸν** was probably chosen instead of **αὐτῷ** on account of **εἰς αὐτὸν** (ver. 16), and because it was stronger and expressed the thought of God or Christ as the goal. The explanation that the angels were confirmed, and thus made unable to fall, is altogether inadequate. Harless, Oltramare and others admit a reconciliation of men and angels to God, but without asserting that **τὰ ἐν τ. οὐρ.** needed reconciliation. Wherever it was needed Christ effected it. But Paul's division of **τὰ π.** into two categories marked by **εἴτε . . . εἴτε** shows that the statement has reference not simply to these classes taken together as a whole, but to each taken singly. Alford, in his suggestive note, after saying that such a reconciliation as that between man and God is not to be thought of, since Christ did not take on Him the seed of angels or pay any propitiatory penalty in the root of their nature, gives as his interpretation "all creation subsists in Christ: all creation therefore is affected by His act of propitiation: sinful creation is, in the strictest sense, *reconciled* from being at enmity: sinless creation, ever at a distance from His unapproachable purity, is lifted into nearer participation and higher glorification of Him, and is thus *reconciled*, though not in the strictest, yet in a very intelligible and allowable sense". Unfortunately this cannot be accepted, for the strict is the only allowable sense. But it is on the right lines, and indicates the direction in which a solution must be sought. This, as several recent scholars have urged (Kl., Gess, Everling and others), is through taking account of the Biblical and Jewish doctrine of angels. That the angels are divided into the sharply separated classes of sinless and demoniacal is a view on which this passage remains inexplicable. Nor is it the Old Testament or the Jewish doctrine, or, it may be added, the doctrine of Paul. Perhaps we need not, with Gess, think of an intermediate class, or, with Ritschl,

of the angels of the Law. To Jewish thought angels stood in the closest relations with men, and were regarded as sharing a moral responsibility for their acts. The angelic princes of earthly kingdoms in Daniel, and the angels of the Churches in the Apocalypse, are Biblical examples of this. A large number of Pauline passages harmonise with the view that the angelic world needed a reconciliation. The detailed proof of this cannot be given here; it belongs to the discussion of the angelology of the Epistle. (See *Introd.*, section ii.) But if the angels needed it, how could it be effected through the blood of the cross? It is not enough to answer with Haupt that the reconciliation of men affected the angels who were closely united with them. A direct effect seems to be intended, and the difficulty is that stated by Holtzmann, that with the flesh all capacity is absent from the angels of Paul, to share in the saving effects of the death of God's Son, which was made possible through the assumption of the flesh, and in which sin in the flesh is condemned. In answer to it these considerations may be urged. The Son is Head of the angels, as He is Head of humanity; therefore His acts had an effect on them independently of their effect on men. His death must not be narrowly conceived as physical only, as the destruction of the material flesh. It was the destruction of the sinful principle; and therefore is independent in its effects of the possession of material bodies by those whom it saves. And this cannot be set aside by the fact that Paul uses such a physical term as blood of the cross, for the death of Christ was surely more to him than a mere physical incident. So far, then, as the angel world was affected by sin, it needed reconciliation, and received it in the atoning and sin-destroying death of Christ its Head. That in this reconciliation evil angels are not included is clear from the fact that Paul does not regard it as having had effect on them corresponding to that on men. Lueken points out that Paul adds "through Him" to the words "through the blood of His cross," and refers the latter to the reconciliation of men and the former to that of angels, so that they are simply said to be reconciled through Christ. But the **δι' αὐτοῦ** is an emphatic resumption of **δι' αὐτοῦ** at the beginning of the verse.—**εἰς αὐτόν.** It is uncertain whether this should be referred to God or Christ. The former is possible, for **αὐτός** may be reflexive, and reconciliation is usually to God (so Eph. ii. 16, also 2 Cor. v. 18-20, Rom. v. 10). We should also have expected **δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτόν** if Christ had been meant. On the other hand, the reference to Christ is favoured by the fact that elsewhere in this passage **αὐτός** always refers to Christ, and by the parallel with ver. 16, **ἐν αὐτῷ . . . δι' αὐτοῦ . . . εἰς αὐτόν.** Decision is difficult; it is perhaps safest to let the Pauline usage determine the reference, and interpret "unto Himself".—**εἰρηνοποιήσας.** In Ephesians great emphasis is laid on the peace between Jew and Gentile, established by the cross, an emphasis quite to be expected where the unity of the Church is the leading thought; but not to be found here, for the peace is obviously between God on the one side and men and angels on the other; besides which the thought would have no relevance in this connexion.—**διὰ τ. αἵματος τ. σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ.** The combination of the two terms is perhaps for the sake of insisting on the historical fact of the reconciling death against the tendency to seek peace with God through angelic mediators.—**τὰ ἐπὶ τ. γῆς,** probably governed by **ἀποκατ.,** rather than **εἰρηνοπ.,** since it and the companion phrase seem to be epexegetical of **τὰ πάντα.**

Ver. 21. For this verse *cf.* Eph. ii. 1, 12. Usually **καὶ ὑμᾶς** is made to begin a new sentence. Even with the reading **ἀποκατήλλαξεν** the construction is not quite regular, but with the probably correct reading, **ἀποκατηλλάγητε,** a violent break in the context is involved, since Paul begins with the second person as the object and suddenly makes it the subject. Such an anacoluthon is possible in dictation, but very improbable unless several words had intervened, so that the beginning of the sentence should be forgotten. This is not the case here. Lachmann (followed by Lightf. and others) takes **νυνὶ δὲ . . . θανάτου** as a parenthesis, in which case **παραστῆσαι** depends on **εὐδόκησε,** and **ὑμᾶς** is repeated "to disentangle the construction". The irregularity is thus avoided. Haupt objects that it is unlikely that Paul should have continued after so long a sentence as ver. 20 with the same construction, and also that the thought in this part of the sentence, "to present you holy," is not co-ordinated to the thoughts in **κατοικ.** and **ἀποκατ.** For in the latter the thought is that it is the Son in whom the fulness dwells and through whom reconciliation is effected. But this thought of the pre-eminence of the Son in the work of salvation is not con-

αὐτοῦ, 23. εἴ γε ἐπιμένετε τῇ πίστει τεθεμελιωμένοι καὶ [m] ἑδραῖοι καὶ μὴ [n] μετακινούμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὗ ἠκούσατε, τοῦ κηρυχθέντος ἐν πάσῃ κτίσει τῇ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν, οὗ ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ Παῦλος διάκονος.

[m] Only here and 1 Cor. vii. 37, xv. 58 in N.T.

[n] Only here in N.T.

tinued in ver. 22, where the thought is of the Christian standing of the Colossians before God. It is therefore unlikely that **παραστ.** should depend on **εὐδοκ.** Accordingly, with Haupt and Weiss, a comma should be placed at the end of ver. 20, and a full stop at the end of ver. 21. **ὑμᾶς** in ver. 21 will then depend on **ἀποκατ.** It might seem an anti-climax after the wide sweep of ver. 20 to narrow down the reference to the Colossians. But we have a similar case in ver. 6, and the personal application of a universal truth is anti-climax only to a rhetorician. The danger of the Colossians makes it peculiarly appropriate here.—**καὶ ὑμᾶς**: "you also".—**ὄντας** emphasises that this state was continuous.—**ἀπηλλοτριωμένους**: "estranged," *i.e.*, from God, probably not to be taken as counted as aliens by God, but as expressing their attitude to God.—**ἐχθροὺς τῇ διανοίᾳ.** Meyer takes **ἐχθ.** as passive, regarded as enemies by God, but the qualification **τῇ διαν.** and the further addition **ἐν. τ. ἔργ. τ. πον.** makes this very improbable. It involves the translation of **τῇ διαν.** "on account of your state of mind," for which **διά** with the accusative would have been expected. But it is much simpler to take **διαν.** as dative of the part affected, and **ἐχθ.** as active, hostile to God in your mind. **διανοία** (used only here and Eph. ii. 3, iv. 18 by Paul) means the higher intellectual nature, but specially on the ethical side; it is usually in the LXX the translation of "heart". Cremer defines it as "the faculty of moral reflexion". **ἐν τ. ἔργοις τοῖς πονηροῖς**: to be connected with **ἀπηλλ. καὶ ἐχθ.** The preposition indicates the sphere in which they were thus estranged and enemies.

Vv. 22, 23. THEIR RECONCILIATION WILL RESULT IN THE PRESENTATION OF THEMSELVES AS BLAMELESS BEFORE GOD, IF THEY ARE STEADFAST IN THE GOSPEL THEY HAVE HEARD, WHICH IS NO OTHER THAN THAT PREACHED THROUGHOUT THE WORLD.—Ver. 22. **νυνὶ** in contrast to **ποτὲ**: "now," not "at the present moment," but "in the present state of things," thus, as Lightfoot points out, admitting an aorist, referring to an action lying in the past. **ἀποκατηλλάγητε**: "ye were reconciled," but scarcely to be represented in English except by the perfect. **ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ.** It is disputed why Paul should add to **σώμ.** the defining words **τ. σαρκὸς α.** Bengel, Lightfoot and Moule think they are added to distinguish Christ's physical from His mystical body, the Church. But this would imply an incredible obtuseness on the part of his readers, for **διὰ θαν.** sufficiently fixes the reference to the physical body; and, as Meyer points out, the contrast to the body of His flesh is the glorified body, not the Church. Nor is a reference to Docetism probable. We have no evidence that it had appeared so early, and Paul would not have refuted it by a mere aside. Oltramare thinks that they are added because the flesh was the actual seat of suffering. But the addition would have been unnecessary, for **ἐν τ. σώμ.** was sufficient in itself. The most satisfactory view is that Paul has in mind the false spiritualism which thought reconciliation could be accomplished by spiritual beings only, and hence attached little or no value to the work of Christ in a body composed of flesh (Mey., Alf., Ell., Haupt, Abb.). In opposition to this Paul emphasises the fact that it was just by the putting to death of this body composed of flesh that reconciliation was effected, and thereby excludes from the work the angels who had no body of flesh. But while this is so, it is hard to avoid the impression that the phrase is also chosen because in the corresponding experience of Christians their death to sin is the removal of the **σῶμα. τ. σαρκός** (ii. 11).—**παραστῆσαι ὑμᾶς**: *cf.* Eph. v. 27. With the reading **ἀποκατήλλαξεν** the infinitive expresses purpose, "He reconciled in order to present". With **ἀποκατηλλάγητε,** if we adopt Lightfoot's parenthesis, the infinitive will depend on **εὐδόκ.** (ver. 19). But if **νυνὶ δὲ** begins a new sentence we should translate "ye were reconciled to present yourselves". This presentation is usually taken to be at the judgment, and that is the impression the passage naturally makes. Hofmann, Lightfoot and Haupt refer it to God's present approbation. Haupt thinks the presentation is just the same as the reconciliation. Reconciliation has not to

24. [1] Νῦν χαίρω ἐν τοῖς παθήμασιν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, καὶ [n] ἀνταναπληρῶ τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν [o] θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου ὑπὲρ τοῦ [o] θλ. τ. X. only here.

[1] So edd. with non-Western authorities, perhaps by homœoteleuton. **ος**: inserted before **νυν** by Haupt with DEFG, perhaps by dittography. See note.

do with a change of feeling in God or man, but of the relation of God to men. It is synonymous with justification. This **παραστ.** is a continuous process dependent on continuance in faith and love. He urges that Paul regards the judgment as depending on moral conditions, not on the holding fast of faith and love. But a distinction of this kind should not be pressed in the case of Paul; for him faith was the root of morality, and love the fulfilment of the Law.—**κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ.** Generally this is taken to be before God. But since Paul elsewhere teaches that we must appear before the judgment seat of Christ, it seems best (with Meyer) to take **αὐτοῦ** in the same way.—**ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους καὶ ἀνεγκλήτους.** Soden and Haupt insist that these are not ethical but religious terms. This is probably correct; since the reference is to the judgment, they have a forensic sense. **ἀμώμους** probably means blameless rather than undefiled, and this is supported by the addition of **ἀνεγκλ.**

Ver. 23. **εἴ γε** with the indicative expresses the Apostle's confidence that the condition will be fulfilled. — **ἐπιμένετε.** This abiding in faith is the only, as it is the sure way, to this presentation of themselves **κατ. αὐτ.** This is directed against the false teachers' assurance that the gospel they had heard needed to be supplemented if they wished to attain salvation. It needs no supplementing, and it is at the peril of salvation that they lose hold of it.—**τεθεμελιωμένοι** refers to the firm foundation, **ἑδραῖοι** to the stability of the building.—**μὴ μετακινούμενοι.** The perfect participle here gives way to the present, expressing a continuous process. It may be passive or middle, probably the former. —**ἀπὸ τ. ἐλπίδος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου**: to be taken with **μετακιν.** alone, not, assuming a zeugma, with the three co-ordinate expressions (Sod.), for it is not at all clear that the last of these keeps up the metaphor of a building. The hope of the Gospel is the hope given by or proclaimed in the Gospel.—**οὗ ἠκούσατε.** Paul again sets his seal on the form of the Gospel which they had received, and again insists on the universality of its proclamation, its catholicity as guaranteeing its truth (see on vv. 5-7).—**ἐν πάσῃ κτίσει**: "in presence of every creature"; **π. κτ.**, as in ver. 15, with the limitation **τ. ὑ. τ. οὐρ.** —**οὗ ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ Παῦλος διάκονος**: *cf.* Eph. iii. 7. This phrase contains a certain stately self-assertion; the Apostle urges the fact that he is a minister of this Gospel as a reason why they should remain faithful to it. His apostolic authority, so far from being impugned by the false teachers, was more probably invoked; so Paul throws it in the balance against them. It is also true that the Gentile mission was so bound up in his own mind with his apostleship that a reference to the one naturally suggested a reference to the other. By this clause Paul effects the transition to ver. 24.

Vv. 24-29. PAUL REJOICES THAT HIS SUFFERINGS ARE FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE CHURCH, IN WHOSE SERVICE HE FULFILS HIS DIVINELY APPOINTED TASK, OF FULLY PREACHING THE LONG HIDDEN BUT NOW REVEALED MYSTERY OF THE GOSPEL, WHICH IS UNIVERSAL IN ITS SCOPE, A TASK IN WHICH HE USES ALL THE MIGHTY STRENGTH WITH WHICH GOD HAS ENDOWED HIM. — Ver. 24. It is usually assumed that **ὃς** read by the Western text is due to dittography; but it may quite as easily have fallen out through homœoteleuton as have been inserted. It is, however, omitted by such an overwhelming combination of MSS. that it would not perhaps be justifiable to place it in the text. On grounds of internal evidence a strong case can be made out for the insertion. Lightfoot omits, and thinks the abruptness characteristic of Paul. He quotes as parallels 2 Cor. vii. 9, 1 Tim. i. 12. But the connexion in the former case is uncertain; Westcott and Hort do not begin a new sentence with **νῦν χαίρω**; if correctly, it is not a true parallel. But if otherwise there is not the abrupt change of subject we find here, for Paul has been speaking of his previous regret, and **νῦν χαίρω** follows naturally on this. In the latter case, apart from the dubious authenticity of the Epistle, ver. 12 naturally continues ver. 11. On the other hand, it is very characteristic of our Epistle for transitions to be effected by the relative. Without it we have no preparation for

σώματος αὐτοῦ, ὅ ἐστιν ἡ ἐκκλησία, 25. ἧς ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ διάκονος, κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς πληρῶσαι

ver. 24, for **νῦν** is not transitional. And with it the appeal to their loyalty in **οὗ ἐγεν. ἐγὼ Π. διάκ.** is greatly strengthened. —**νῦν χαίρω**: "I now rejoice," not "now, in contrast to times of repining," or "now as I contemplate the greatness of redemption," but simply "in my present condition as a prisoner". Joy in suffering is a familiar Pauline idea.—**ἐν τοῖς παθήμασιν**: not, as Meyer and Haupt, "over my sufferings," for which **ἐπὶ** would have been expected (though *cf.* Phil. i. 18, Luke x. 20), but "in my sufferings," **ἐν** denoting the sphere in which, not (as Ell.) both sphere in and subject over which.—**ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν**: *i.e.*, for your benefit. Oltramare compares Phil. i. 29, Eph. iii. 1, 13, 1 Pet. iii. 18, and interprets "for love of you"—a fine thought; but probably that is not in Paul's mind.—**ἀνταναπληρῶ**. The meaning of this verb is much disputed. **ἀναπληροῦν** is "to fill up". **ἀντι-** in composition has, according to Grimm, the following senses: opposite, over against; the mutual efficiency of two; requital; hostile opposition; official substitution; but some of these do not occur with verbs. He explains it in this way: "What is wanting of the affliction of Christ to be borne by me, that I supply in order to repay the benefits which Christ conferred on me by filling up the measure of the afflictions laid upon Him". **ἀντι-** on this view means "in return for". Another view proposed is that Paul makes up by present suffering for his former persecution. Winer (followed by Lightf., Findl., Moule) says **ἀναπλ.** is used of him who "**ὑστέρημα** *a se* relictum *ipse* explet," and **ἀνταναπλ.** of him who "alterius **ὑστέρημα** de suo explet" (quoted in Meyer). The parallels Lightfoot quotes are intended to show that "the supply comes from an opposite quarter to the defect". He takes the sense to be that Paul suffers instead of Christ, and translates "I fill up on my part," "I supplement". Abbott pertinently points out that in the two instances in which **ἀναπληροῦν** is used with **ὑστέρημα** (1 Cor. xvi. 17, Phil. ii. 30) the supply comes from an opposite quarter to the defect, and therefore we have no more reason for including this idea in **ἀνταναπλ.** than in **ἀναπλ.** The simplest explanation is that of Wetstein, "**ἀντὶ ὑστερήματος** succeedit **ἀναπλήρωμα**". (So Mey., Ell., Alf., Haupt, Abb.) We thus get the idea that over against or corresponding to the previous defect comes the filling up. To Lightfoot's criticism that this deprives **ἀντὶ** of its force, Ellicott replies that there is no such clear correspondence of personal agents as would be needed to substantiate the assertion. It is impossible to feel sure which of these views is right, but this is of negative importance, since it excludes arguments (such as Lightfoot's) as to the meaning of the rest of the verse, based on the sense of this verb.—**τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ.** Leaving out of account such interpretations as "afflictions for the sake of Christ," or "afflictions imposed by Christ," the following are the chief views that have been taken: (1) Many Romanist commentators explain the sufferings of Christ to be His mediatorial sufferings, left incomplete by Him and completed by His saints, Paul taking his share in this. (2) Lightfoot, Oltramare, Findlay, Haupt and others agree with (1) in taking **τ. θλ. τ. X.** as the sufferings which Christ endured on earth. But they deny that these are mediatorial sufferings; they had "a ministerial utility". Christ suffered for the kingdom of God, and His followers must continue this. Hofmann's view is a special form of this. Christ was sent only to Israel, and endured sufferings in His ministry to it. Paul fills up what is left of these sufferings, as Apostle to the Gentiles. (3) Meyer, followed by Abbott, thinks the afflictions are Paul's own, and are called the afflictions of Christ, because they are of the same essential character. Since his sufferings are still incomplete, he speaks of filling up the measure of them. (4) The sufferings are those of the Church, which are still incomplete. They are called the afflictions of Christ because they are those of His body. Thus Bengel: "Fixa est mensura passionum, quas tota exantlare debet ecclesia. Quo plus igitur Paulus exhausit, eo minus et ipsi posthac et caeteris relinquitur. Hoc facit communio sanctorum." Cremer similarly says that the defect is not in what Christ suffered, but in the communion of the Church in His sufferings. Paul concentrates on himself the hate of the world against Christ and His Church. (5) The sufferings are the sufferings of

τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, 26. τὸ μυστήριον τὸ [p] ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν [q] αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν, νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ,

[p] Only here and 1 Cor. ii. 7; Eph. iii. 9; Luke x. 21 in N.T.

[q] 1 Cor. ii. 7; Eph. iii. 11; *cf.* Rom. xvi. 25.

Christ, not, however, those which He endured on earth, but those which He endures in Paul through their mystical union. The defect is not (as in 4) in the sufferings of the Church, but in Christ's sufferings in Paul. (1) must be set aside on the ground that **θλίψις** is not used of Christ's atoning sufferings, for which Paul employs **αἷμα, θάνατος, σταυρός.** (3) must be rejected because the afflictions of Christ can hardly mean afflictions like those of Christ. (4) is to be rejected on similar grounds, the defect is in Christ's own suffering, not in that of the Church. Besides there would be an un-Pauline arrogance in the claim that he was filling up the yet incomplete sufferings of the Church. We are thus left with (2) and (5), each of which takes "the afflictions of Christ" in the strict sense of afflictions endured by Christ Himself. We cannot, with Lightfoot, decide against (5) on the ground that **ἀνταναπλ.** excludes an identification between the sufferings of Paul and Christ. Hofmann's view is very attractive on account of the context, in which Paul is speaking of his Apostleship to the Gentiles. It is perhaps the best form of (2), and may be right. It, however, labours, with (2) generally, under the objection that it implies defect in Christ's earthly sufferings, for **ὑστέρημα** means defect, and also that the claim thus made to fill up the defect left by Christ is strangely arrogant. It is therefore best to accept (5). It is urged that there is no N.T. parallel to the idea that Christ suffers in His members. But, apart from Acts ix. 4, Paul's doctrine of union with Christ is such that we should almost be compelled to infer that Christ suffered in His members, even if Paul had not here affirmed it. And there is no arrogance here. For Paul does not claim to fill up the defects in Christ's earthly suffering or in the sufferings of the Church, but in the sufferings which he has to endure in his flesh, which are Christ's sufferings, because he and Christ are one. We should accordingly take **τ. θλ. τ. X.** with **ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου** as a single idea, "Christ's sufferings in my flesh".—**ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου.** There is a delicate contrast between the flesh of Paul and the body of Christ. If these words were connected with **ἀνταναπλ.** they would probably have immediately followed.—**ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ**: "on behalf of His body". This may simply mean that the sufferings of Paul advanced the interests of the Church (*cf.* Phil. i. 12-14). But, taking into account Paul's strong feeling of the solidarity of the Church, he probably means that apart from any furthering of the Church's interests which his imprisonment may bring about, the suffering of one of the members must benefit the whole body; just as in a higher and fuller sense the suffering of the Head had procured salvation for the Church. Paul rejoices, not, as Abbott says the view taken of **τ. θλ. τ. X.** would involve, "because they went to increase the afflictions of Christ," but because his afflictions, which were those of Christ also in the necessity of the case, were a blessing to Christ's body.—**ὅ ἐστιν ἡ ἐκκλησία**: "that is, the Church," perhaps added because **σάρξ** and **σῶμα** occur together here, and the readers might be confused as to the precise meaning of **σώματος.**

Ver. 25. **ἧς ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ διάκονος.** With these words Paul returns to ver. 23, speaking of himself here, however, as a minister of the Church, there of the Gospel. Because he is a minister of the Church, it is a joy to suffer for its welfare. He proceeds to explain what his peculiar (**ἐγὼ** emphatic) ministry is.—**κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν**: *cf.* Eph. iii. 2. **οἰκ.** is "stewardship" rather than "dispensation" (*cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 17). **τ. Θεοῦ** indicates that this office is held in the house of God, or that it has been entrusted to him by God.—**εἰς ὑμᾶς**: to be taken with **δοθ.** as in Eph. iii. 2, not with **πληρ.** (as by Chrys. and Hofm.). It means towards you Gentiles, that is for your benefit. The context shows that the Gentiles are uppermost in his thought. —**πληρῶσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ**: "to fulfil the word of God". **πλ.** is taken by some of the completion by this letter of the teaching already given to the Colossians. But Paul is speaking of the function specially entrusted to him. Generally this is explained of the geographical extension of the Gospel. Haupt thinks the geographical point of view is not present here. An essential characteristic of the Gospel is its universality. Paul's special mission is to bring this to realisa-

27. οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ Θεὸς γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ὅ[1] ἐστιν Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, ἡ ἐλπὶς

[1] So Ln., Tr., W.H., R.V. with ABFGP 17. **ος**: T., Ws. with ℵCDEKL, by attraction to gender of **Χριστος**.

tion. This he does by proclaiming the Gospel to the Gentiles, thus making clear the true nature of the Gospel. This suits the context better, for Paul proceeds to define the mystery entrusted to him as the universality of salvation, not the wide extension of the Gospel. Other interpretations may be seen in Meyer or Eadie.

Ver. 26. Partially parallel to Eph. iii. 9. How great the honour conferred on Paul is, appears from the fact that he is entrusted with the duty of declaring the long concealed secret which is the distinguishing mark of his Gospel.—**τὸ μυστήριον.** Lightfoot thinks that the term is borrowed by Paul from the Greek mysteries, and that it is intentionally chosen to point the contrast between those secret mysteries and the Gospel which is offered to all. But for the mysteries the plural was employed. And there would be more justification for this interpretation in Matt. xiii. 11 = Luke viii. 10, where the disciples are told by Jesus that to them it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom, but not to others. But it will not be seriously supposed that Christ borrowed the term from the Greek mysteries. A mystery is a truth which man cannot know by his natural powers, so that if it is known it must be revealed.—**τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν.** Usually **ἀπὸ** is taken as temporal, and this agrees with the fact that similar references in Paul are temporal (1 Cor. ii. 7, Rom. xvi. 25), and with the use of **ἀπὸ** as in **ἀπ' αἰῶνος** and **ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου** (Matt. xxv. 34). **ἀπὸ καταβολῆς** occurs with **κρύπτω** (Matt. xiii. 35). But elsewhere **ἀπὸ** after **κρύπτω** or **ἀποκρύπτω** indicates those from whom a thing is concealed. In favour of this meaning here is the order, for if **ἀπὸ τ. αἰ.** were temporal **ἀπὸ τ. γεν.** would be included as a matter of course. It has been so taken here, not by Klöpper, who suggests it as possible, but does not accept it, but by Franke. He thinks both are terms for angels, and in itself such a reference is not improbable, for it is through the Church that the principalities and powers come to learn the manifold wisdom of God (Eph. iii. 9, where just before the mystery is said to have been concealed **ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων**). But we have no evidence that **γενεαί** was ever used in this way, and no parallel for this use of **αἰῶνες** in N.T. Without identifying the terms with personal existences, we may with Haupt (*cf.* also Soden) take **αἰῶνες** of the ages before the world, and **γενεαί** of the generations of human history. This will be practically the same as saying that the mystery was concealed from angels and men. This is probably the meaning of Bengel's note: "Aeones referuntur ad angelos; generationes, ad homines". Theodoret, followed by Klöpper, thinks that there is a polemical reference here to the antiquity of the Gospel and its consequent superiority to the Law. Abbott thinks the point of the reference to the long concealment and recent disclosure is that the acceptance of the false teaching is thus explained. But the non-polemical character of parallel passages makes these suggestions very uncertain. —**νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη.** The construction here changes, and the perfect participle is continued by the aorist indicative (Winer-Moulton, p. 717). The anacoluthon is caused by Paul's intense joy that the long silence has been broken; he is content with nothing short of a definite statement of the glorious fact. **νῦν** is equally appropriate whether **ἀπὸ** is temporal or not, for the antithesis of past and present lies in the nature of the case.—**τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ**: *i.e.*, to Christians generally, not to the Jewish Christians (Hofm.), who certainly were not specially enlightened on this matter, nor the Apostles and prophets of the New Covenant, even though in the parallel Eph. iii. 5 they are chosen for mention, nor the angels, in spite of Eph. iii. 10. The words must be taken in their obvious sense.

Ver. 27. *Cf.* for a partial parallel Eph. i. 18.—**οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ Θεὸς**: "inasmuch as to them God willed"; **ἠθέλ.** is chosen to express the idea that the revelation had its source solely in God's will.—**τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης.**: *cf.* Rom. ix. 23, Phil. iv. 19, Eph. i. 18, iii. 16. The expression does not mean the glorious riches, but rather how rich is the glory. The use of "glory" immediately after

τῆς δόξης, 28. ὃν ἡμεῖς καταγγέλλομεν, [r]νουθετοῦντες πάντα ἄν- r Paul only in N.T.
θρωπον καὶ διδάσκοντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ, ἵνα παραστήσωμεν πάντα ἄνθρωπον τέλειον ἐν Χριστῷ· 29. εἰς ὃ καὶ κοπιῶ, ἀγωνιζόμενος κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν δυνάμει.

in the sense of the Messianic kingdom favours the adoption of that meaning here. But as it is an attribute of the mystery it probably expresses its glorious character.—**ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν** is generally taken with **τί τὸ πλ. κ.τ.λ.**, and this gives an excellent sense, for it was as manifested in the Gentile mission that the glory of the Gospel was especially displayed. There is a little awkwardness, since the definition **Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν** seems to make **ἐν τ. ἔθν.** unnecessary. The glory of the mystery was itself **X. ἐν ὑμ.** if we take **ἐν ὑμῖν** to mean among you Gentiles. This hardly justifies us in connecting the words with **γνωρίσαι** (Haupt), for it already has the recipients of knowledge attached to it (**οἷς**).—**ὅ ἐστι** answers **τί τὸ πλοῦτος κ.τ.λ.** The riches of the glory of the mystery consist in **X. ἐν ὑμ. ἡ ἐλπ. τ. δ.** Usually **ὅ** is taken to refer to **μυστηρίου** alone. Perhaps the practical difference is not great.—**Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν ἡ ἐλπὶς τῆς δόξης.** Haupt thinks no comma should be placed after **ὑμῖν**, and that the meaning is that the special glory of the Gospel is that Christ among them is the hope of glory. But the usual view which makes, not the fact that Christ among them guarantees their future blessedness, but the presence of Christ itself, the great glory of the mystery seems much finer. **X. ἐν ὑμ.**, and not what **X. ἐν ὑμ.** is, constitutes the riches of the glory. The context shows that **ὑμῖν** must mean "you Gentiles". It does not necessarily follow from this that **ἐν** must be translated "among," though this is favoured by **ἐν τ. ἔθν.** It may refer to the indwelling of Christ in the heart, and this is rendered probable by the addition of **ἐλπὶς τ. δόξης.** The indwelling Christ constitutes in Himself a pledge of future glory. For this combination of the indwelling Christ with the Christian hope, *cf.* Rom. viii. 10.

Ver. 28. **ὃν**: *i.e.*, **Χριστὸν ἐν ὑμῖν.**—**ἡμεῖς**: (emphatic) we in contrast to the false teachers. But the reference seems to be simply to Paul, not to Timothy and Epaphras as well. For throughout the section he is speaking of his own special mission.—**νουθετοῦντες.** Meyer points out that admonishing and teaching correspond to the two main elements of the evangelic preaching, repent and believe. Haupt thinks on the ground of the order that Paul is not referring to elementary Christian teaching, but has this epistle in his mind. The order might, however, suggest warning to non-Christians followed by teaching of new converts. But the addition of **ἐν π. σοφίᾳ** and **τέλειον** support the view that it is warning against error, and advanced teaching that he has in view.—**πάντα ἄνθρωπον**: emphatically repeated here. The Gospel is for all men, in opposition to any exclusiveness, and for each individual man in particular. And the ideal is only attained when each individual has reached completeness. The exclusiveness might be, as with the Judaisers, of a sectarian type, or, as with the Gnostics, and possibly here, of an intellectual, aristocratic type. Since such is the Apostle's task, he addresses a Church the members of which are unknown to him.—**ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ** is taken by some to express the content of the teaching, everyone may be fully instructed in the whole of Christian wisdom. This forms a good contrast to the probable practice of the false teachers of reserving their higher teaching for an inner circle. But for this we should have expected the accusative. Probably the words express the manner of teaching. If the phrase is taken with both participles the content of the teaching is excluded.—**παραστήσ.**: probably to present at the judgment.—**τέλειον.** Here also allusion to the mysteries is discovered by Lightfoot. The term is said to have been employed to distinguish the fully initiated from novices. But, even if this be correct, the word is used in Matt. v. 48, xix. 21, where such a reference is out of the question. Probably Paul is contrasting the completeness he strives to secure with that promised by the false teachers.

Ver. 29. **εἰς ὅ**: to achieve which end.—**κοπιῶ** expresses toil carried to the point of weariness.—**ἀγωνιζόμενος**: a metaphor from the arena. Meyer takes the reference to be to inward striving against difficulties and hostile forces.

II. 1. ΘΕΛΩ γὰρ ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι [a] ἡλίκον ἀγῶνα ἔχω ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ τῶν ἐν Λαοδικίᾳ καὶ ὅσοι οὐχ ἑόρακαν τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἐν σαρκί, 2. ἵνα παρακληθῶσιν αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν, συνβιβασθέντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ καὶ εἰς πᾶν πλοῦτος τῆς [b] πληροφορίας τῆς συνέσεως, εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν

a Only here, Gal. vi. 11 (B 17); Jas. iii. 5 in N.T.

b Only here, 1 Thess. i. 5; Heb. vi. 11, x. 22 in class· or Bib. Gk.

Perhaps both inward and outward struggle are referred to (De W.).—**κατὰ.** The struggle is carried on in proportion not to his natural powers, but to the mightily working energy of Christ within him.—**ἐνεργουμένην**: a dynamic middle (*cf.* ver. 6).

CHAPTER II.—Vv. 1-3. PAUL'S DEEP CONCERN FOR THE COLOSSIANS AND OTHER CHRISTIANS UNKNOWN TO HIM, THAT THEY MAY BE UNITED IN LOVE, AND ATTAIN FULL KNOWLEDGE OF CHRIST, IN WHOM RESIDE ALL THE TREASURES OF WISDOM AND KNOWLEDGE. —**θέλω γὰρ ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι**: for the formula *cf.* 1 Cor. xi. 3, and for a similar formula Phil. i. 12. More frequently the negative is used, **οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν. γὰρ** introduces the proof of what he has just said, by the illustration from the case of his readers, and thus prepares the way for the warning that follows in ver. 4.—**ἀγῶνα**: the inward struggle of Paul will embrace his prayers, his anxiety and his earnest meditation on the implications of the false teaching and the best manner of refuting it. Added to this are the difficulties caused by his imprisonment and the fact that the Colossians were personally unknown to him.—**Λαοδικίᾳ.** The members of this Church were probably exposed to the same dangers as their neighbours.—**καὶ ὅσοι κ.τ.λ.** So far as the words themselves go, they may mean that the Colossians and Laodiceans did belong to the number of those who had not seen him or that they did not. But the latter alternative is very improbable, for Paul would not have joined a general reference to Churches unknown to him to a special mention of two Churches that were known to him. Further, Paul continues with **αὐτῶν,** which refers to **καὶ ὅσοι,** but must include the Colossians, since in ver. 4 he says, "This I say that no one may delude *you*". This also corresponds to the use of **καὶ ὅσοι** after an enumeration. The narrative in Acts favours this view, as does the absence of any hint in the Epistle that Paul had visited Colossæ. We may therefore safely assume with almost all commentators that the Apostle was personally unknown to both of these Churches.—**ἐν σαρκί**: to be taken with **τὸ πρ. μου,** not with **ἑόρ.**

Ver. 2. **παρακληθῶσιν.** It is disputed what meaning should be attached to this. Meyer, Ellicott and others translate "may be comforted". This seems to be the more usual sense in Paul, and is supported by the addition "knit together in love," which favours an emotional reference. It is more probable, however, that we should translate "may be strengthened" (De W., Alf., Kl., Ol., Sod.), for this was more needed than consolation in face of heresy. Oltramare quotes Rom. i. 12 (where, however, **συμπαρ.** is used), 1 Thess. iii. 2, 2 Thess. ii. 17, where this verb is joined to **στηρίζειν** to show that this sense is Pauline, and in the latter we have **παρακαλέσαι ὑμῶν τ. καρδίας καὶ στηρίξαι.** Haupt, following Luther, thinks it means "may be warned," but this does not suit **καρδίαι,** especially in iv. 8.—**αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν.** We might have expected **ὑμῶν,** but **καὶ ὅσοι,** while not excluding the Colossians, includes other Churches as well. **καρδία** implies more than our word "heart," it embraces also the intellect and the will.—**συνβιβασθέντες** agrees with **αὐτοί,** understood as the equivalent of **αἱ κ. αὐτῶν.** In the LXX the word means "to instruct" (so in 1 Cor. ii. 16, which is a quotation from Isa. xl. 14). But joined to **ἐν ἀγ.** it must have its usual sense, "knit together," as in ver. 19 and Eph. iv. 16. There may be a reference to the divisive tendencies of the false teaching.—**καὶ εἰς πᾶν πλοῦτος τῆς πληροφορίας τῆς συνέσεως**: "and unto all riches of the fulness of understanding". **καὶ εἰς** is to be taken with **συνβιβ.,** "knit together in order to attain". **συνβιβ.** is a verb implying motion, and therefore is followed here by **εἰς.** It is usual to take **πληροφ.** as "full assurance," but the expression "all the riches of full assurance of understanding" has a strange redundance, which seems scarcely to be met, as Klöpper thinks, by De Wette's remark that **πλοῦτ.** is a quantitative but **πληρ.** a qualitative expression. Accordingly it seems better, with Grimm and Haupt, to translate "fulness," a sense which is possible everywhere in N.T. except 1 Thess. i. 5.

τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ,[1] 3. ἐν ᾧ εἰσὶν πάντες οἱ θησαυροὶ τῆς σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως [c] ἀπόκρυφοι.

[c] Only here, Mark iv. 22; Luke viii. 17 in N.T.

[1] So edd. with B, Hil. του Θεου ο εστιν Χριστος: D, by explanation; του Θεου του εν Χριστω: 17, by explanation: του Θεου: DbP 37, 67**, 71, by omission to remove difficulty; του Θεου πατρος Χριστου: ℵ, by insertion of πατρος to remove difficulty; του Θεου και Χριστου: Cyr., by insertion of και with similar object.

For συν. see on i. 9. Insight into Christian truth is meant here.—**εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ.** Probably this is in apposition to the previous clause, **εἰς πᾶν κ.τ.λ.**, and further explains it; all the rich fulness of insight, which he trusts may be the fruit of their union in love, is nothing else than full knowledge of the Divine mystery, even Christ. The false teachers bid them seek knowledge in other sources than Christ, Paul insists on the contrary that full knowledge of the mystery of God is all the wealth of fulness of understanding, and is to be found in the knowledge of Christ alone. This makes it probable that the correct interpretation of the true reading is to take **Χριστοῦ** as in apposition to **μυστηρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ** (so Ell., Lightf., Findl., Hofm., Holtzmann, Haupt). It is true that this is curt and harsh, and that we should have expected **ὅ ἐστιν,** but it suits the context better than the translation "the mystery of the God of Christ" (Mey., Gess, Kl., Sod., Weiss and apparently Abb.). It is true that Paul uses a similar expression in Eph. i. 17. But here it would emphasise the subordination of Christ, which is precisely what is out of place in a passage setting forth His all-sufficiency, and against a doctrine the special peril of which lay in its tendency to under-estimate both the Person and the Work of Christ. The grammatically possible apposition of **X.** with **Θεοῦ** (Hilary) is out of the question. Christ is the mystery of God, since in Him God's eternal purpose of salvation finds its embodiment. Hort's conjecture that the original reading was **τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ** does not find sufficient support in the textual or exegetical difficulties of the clause.

Ver. 3. **ἐν ᾧ** may refer to **μυστηρίου** (Beng., Mey., Alf., Ol., Sod., Haupt, Abb.) or to **Χριστοῦ** (Ell., Hofm., Lightf., Holtzmann, Findl., Moule). The former is defended on the ground that **ἀπόκρ.** corresponds to **μυστ.** It is also urged that **μυστ.** is the leading idea. On the other hand, if Christ is rightly identified with the mystery, there is no practical difference between the two views, and it is simpler to refer **ᾧ** to **X.** as the nearer noun.—**εἰσὶν πάντες οἱ θησαυροὶ τῆς σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως ἀπόκρυφοι.** Bengel, Meyer and Alford take **ἀπόκρ.** as an ordinary adjective with **θησαυροὶ,** "in whom are all the hidden treasures". For this we should have expected **οἱ ἀπόκρ.,** and there is no stress on the fact that the hidden treasures are in Christ, yet the position of the word at the end of the sentence is explained as due to emphasis. Generally Chrysostom has been followed in taking it as the predicate to **εἰσὶν,** "in whom are hidden all the treasures". But this is excluded by its distance from the verb. Accordingly it should be taken as a secondary predicate, and thus equivalent to an adverb, "in whom are all the treasures . . . hidden," *i.e.*, in whom all the treasures are, and are in a hidden manner (Hofm., Ell., Lightf., Sod., Haupt, Abb.). The force of the passage then is this: all, and not merely some of, the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are contained in Christ, therefore the search for them outside of Him is doomed to failure. But not only are they in Christ, but they are contained in a hidden way. Therefore they do not lie on the surface, but must be sought for earnestly, as men seek for hidden treasure. They are not matters of external observances, such as the false teachers enjoined, but to be apprehended by deep and serious meditation. If Lightfoot is right in thinking that **ἀπόκρ.** is borrowed from the terminology of the false teachers, there is the added thought that the wisdom they fancied they found in their secret books was really to be found in Christ alone. But it is hardly likely that there is any such reference here. Even if the allusion to literature were more plausible than it is, there is no evidence that the word was used in this sense so early. Besides it occurs twice with **θησ.** in the LXX. The distinction between **σοφίας** and **γνώσεως** is not easy to make here; the former is general, the latter special. Lightfoot says: "While **γνῶσις** applies chiefly to the apprehension of truths, **σοφία** super-

d Class. only here and Jas. i. 22 in N.T.
e Only here in Bib. Gk.

4. τοῦτο [1] λέγω ἵνα μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς [d] παραλογίζηται ἐν [e] πιθανολογίᾳ. 5. εἰ γὰρ καὶ τῇ σαρκὶ ἄπειμι, ἀλλὰ τῷ πνεύματι σὺν ὑμῖν εἰμί, χαίρων καὶ βλέπων ὑμῶν τὴν τάξιν καὶ τὸ [n] στερέωμα τῆς εἰς Χριστὸν

[1] So T., W.H., R.V. with ℵAB. δε: inserted after τουτο by Ln., [Tr.], Ws. with most other authorities.

adds the power of reasoning about them and tracing their relations". Moule thinks it is God's wisdom and knowledge that are here attributed to Christ, but this seems uncertain.

Vv. 4-15. PAUL URGES HIS READERS NOT TO BE BEGUILED BY PLAUSIBLE WORDS, BUT TO HOLD CHRIST FAST AS THE PRINCIPLE OF MORAL CONDUCT. THEY MUST LET NO ONE TAKE THEM CAPTIVE BY DECEITFUL PHILOSOPHY AND HUMAN TRADITION, WITH THE ELEMENTS OF THE WORLD AND NOT CHRIST FOR ITS CONTENT. IN HIM ALONE DWELLS THE WHOLE FULNESS OF THE GODHEAD, AND THEIR COMPLETENESS IS IN HIM. THEY HAVE DIED, BEEN BURIED AND RAISED WITH HIM, GOD HAS QUICKENED THEM WITH HIM, WHILE THEY WERE DEAD IN SINS, HAS CANCELLED THE HOSTILE LAW ON THE CROSS, AND SPOILED AND LED IN TRIUMPH THE PRINCIPALITIES AND POWERS.—Ver. 4. **τοῦτο λέγω.** Haupt thinks the reference is only to ver. 3, but this verse looks back as far as 2b, and ver. 5 to ver. 1. Generally the reference of **τοῦτο** is thought to be vv. 1-3, though Soden thinks it is to i. 24-ii. 3. —**παραλογίζηται** means to deceive by false reckoning, then, as here, by false reasoning. — **πιθανολογίᾳ**: "persuasive speech". The word has no bad sense in itself, and what bad sense it has here it gets from **παραλογ.** Classical writers use it with the meaning of probable argument as opposed to strict demonstration.

Ver. 5. **γὰρ** is difficult. Meyer thinks that the fact of his spiritual presence is mentioned, in contrast to his bodily absence, as a reason why they should not let themselves be deceived. Ellicott (after Chrysostom) thinks that he is explaining why he can advise them, it is because he thus knows their need. Lightfoot, Soden, Findlay and Haupt think he explains his warning by his personal interest in them. —**καὶ** goes closely with **τῇ σαρκὶ**. The dative is one of reference, and **τῇ σαρκὶ** is equivalent to "in the body". There is not the least ground for the inference that Paul had ever been to Colossæ.—**τῷ πνεύματι**: not "by the Holy Spirit," but "in spirit". Paul's own spirit is meant as in 1 Cor. v. 3, 4.—**σὺν ὑμῖν εἰμί**: not simply among you, but "united with you through the warmest community of interest" (Sod.).—**χαίρων καὶ βλέπων.** Many take this as if it were equivalent to "rejoicing to see," but it is questionable if the words can mean this. If the object of his joy is the condition of the Church, we should have expected an inversion of the order, first seeing and then rejoicing at what he saw. Lightfoot explains the order as indicating that he looked because it gave him joy to look. Ellicott assumes a continuation of the words **σὺν ὑμῖν**, "rejoicing with you and beholding". Meyer thinks **χαίρων** means rejoicing to be thus present with you in spirit. It is very difficult to decide as to the meaning, possibly Ellicott's view is best.—**τὴν τάξιν καὶ τὸ στερέωμα.** A military sense is often found in both of these nouns, though sometimes (as by Ol.) it is restricted to the latter. Meyer and Abbott deny the military reference altogether. Both words are used in a military sense, but this is suggested by the context, and it is said that "here the context suggests nothing of the kind" (Abb.). Haupt decides for it on the ground of the connexion. If the terms had been general, Paul would not have placed his joy over their order before his mention of their faith. But in representing them as a well-ordered army, and then expressing the same idea under the image of a bulwark which consists in their faith, the order is correct. It is, however, very questionable if an argument from order of this kind is to be pressed. Lightfoot translates **στερέωμα** "solid front". It may have simply the sense of firm foundation. Whatever the precise force of the words, it is clear that the Church as a whole remained true to the doctrine it had been taught.—**πίστεως**: *cf.* Acts xvi. 5, 1 Pet. v. 9.

Ver. 6. **ὡς οὖν παρελάβετε.** Oltramare translates "since," and interprets, "since ye have received Christ . . . it is in Him you must walk". But probably the usual interpretation "as" is right, meaning the form in which they had

πίστεως ὑμῶν. 6. ὡς οὖν παρελάβετε τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Κύριον, ἐν αὐτῷ περιπατεῖτε, 7. ἐρριζωμένοι καὶ ἐποικοδομούμενοι ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ βεβαιούμενοι τῇ πίστει καθὼς ἐδιδάχθητε, περισσεύοντες[1] ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ. 8. βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται[2] ὁ [f] συλαγωγῶν διὰ τῆς

[f] Only here in class. or Bib. Gk.

[1] So T., Tr., R.V., Ws. with ℵAC 17. εν αυτη: added after περισσευοντες, Ln., [Tr.], [W.H.] with BD^{c}EKL, by assimilation to iv. 2.

[2] So T., Tr., W.H., R.V., Ws. with BCKLP. εσται υμας: Ln., W.H. mg. with ℵADE. to connect more closely with συλαγωγων.

received (= καθὼς ἐμάθετε, i. 7). The sense is, in that case, live in accordance with what you received, and the emphasis is on περιπ., not on ἐν αὐτῷ. —παρελάβετε is practically equivalent to ἐμάθετε, received by instruction, rather than received into the heart.—τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Κύριον. This is frequently translated "the Christ, even Jesus the Lord" (Hofm., Lightf., Sod., Haupt, Abb.). In favour of this is the fact that ὁ Χ. Ἰ. is not a Pauline expression, but neither is Ἰ. ὁ Κύριος. A further argument in its favour is that ὁ Χριστός is very frequent in this Epistle, and especially prominent in this section of it. If this is so we must suppose that Paul has chosen the form of words to meet some false view at Colossæ. A reference to a Judaistic conception of the Messiah, held by the false teachers, which failed to rise to the Christian conception of His Person as Lord, is supposed by Haupt to be intended. This is possible, but the other possible view "ye received Christ Jesus as Lord" is no more inconsistent with Pauline usage, and emphasises still more the Lordship of Christ, which it was the chief aim of the Apostle to assert. There seems to be no hint that the Messiahship of Jesus was challenged; at most there was the question what Messiahship involved. More probably there is no reference to the Messiahship at all.

Ver. 7. ἐρριζωμένοι καὶ ἐποικοδομούμενοι: "rooted and built up". The metaphor changes from περιπατ., and again from ἐρριζ., though Lightfoot points out that the term "to root" is not infrequently applied to buildings. More important is the change in tense, the perfect participle expressing an abiding result, the present a continuous process. ἐν αὐτῷ probably belongs to both. We should not (with Schenkel, Hofm.) place a full stop at περιπ. and take the participles with βλέπετε, which would be intolerably awkward.—βεβαιούμενοι τῇ πίστει: "stablished in faith," also the present of continuous process. Meyer and Lightfoot take the dative as instrumental, but it seems best with most recent commentators to take it as a dative of reference (*cf.* ver. 5).—καθὼς ἐδιδάχθητε: *cf.* καθὼς ἐμάθετε, i. 7. The words define τῇ πίστει.—περισσεύοντες ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ. Oltramare notes that "thankfulness is a preservative against the new doctrines," since they remove Christ from His true place. The emphasis on thankfulness is very marked in this Epistle.

Ver. 8. Paul once more (previously in ver. 4) begins to attack the false teachers, but turns aside in ver. 9 from the direct attack to lay the basis for the decisive attack in vv. 16-23.—τις. It is not clear that we can infer from the singular that only one false teacher had appeared in the Colossian Church.—ὑμᾶς is placed in an emphatic position, and its force is "you whose Christian course has been so fair, and who have received such exhortations to remain steadfast".—ἔσται: the future indicative after μή implies a more serious estimate of the danger than the subjunctive. For the construction, τις followed by a participle with the article, *cf.* Gal. i. 7, Luke xviii. 9.—συλαγωγῶν. The sense is disputed. Several of the Fathers and some modern writers think it means "to rob". It is used in this sense with οἶκον (Aristaen., 2, 22), and Field (*Notes on the Translation of the N.T.*, p. 195) says "there can be no better rendering than 'lest any man *rob* you'". But, as Soden points out, that of which they were robbed should have been expressed. It is better to take it with most commentators in the more obvious sense "lead you away as prey". The verb is so used in Heliod., Æth., x., 35 (with θυγατέρα), Nicet., Hist., 5, 96 (with παρθένον), and it may be chosen with the special sense of seduction in mind.—διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης. The second noun is explanatory of the first, as is shown by the absence of the article and preposition before it and the

g ii. 20; Gal. iv. 3, *cf.* ver. 9; 2 Pet. iii. 10, 12; Heb. v. 12.

φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, κατὰ τὰ [g] στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου καὶ οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν· 9. ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ

lack of any indication that Paul had two evils to attack. The meaning is "his philosophy, which is vain deceit". The word has, of course, no reference to Greek philosophy, and probably none to the allegorical method of Scripture exegesis that the false teachers may have employed. Philo uses it of the law of Judaism, and Josephus of the three Jewish sects. Here, no doubt, it means just the false teaching that threatened to undermine the faith of the Church. There is no condemnation of philosophy in itself, but simply of the empty, but plausible, sham that went by that name at Colossæ. Hort thinks that the sense is akin to the later usage of the word to denote the ascetic life.—**κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων**: "according to human tradition" as opposed to Divine revelation. Meyer, Ellicott and Findlay connect with **συλαγ.** It is more usual to connect with **ἀπ.** or **τ. φιλ. κ. κεν. ἀπ.** The last is perhaps best. It indicates the source from which their teaching was drawn.—**κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου.** [On this phrase the following authorities may be referred to: Hilgenfeld, *Galaterbrief*, pp. 66 *sq.*; Lipsius, *Paul. Rechtf.*, p. 83; Ritschl, *Rechtf. u. Vers.*,[3] ii., 252; Klöpper, *ad loc.*; Spitta, 2 *Pet. u. Jud.*, 263 *sq.*; Everling, *Paul. Angel. u. Dämon.*, pp. 65 *sq.*; Haupt, *ad loc.*; Abbott, *ad loc.* The best and fullest account in English is Massie's article "Elements" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible.* To these may now be added St. John Thackeray, *The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*, pp. 163-170, and Deissmann's article "Elements" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica.*] Originally **στ.** meant the letters of the alphabet, then in Plato and later writers the physical elements, and lastly (but only from the first century A.D.) the rudiments of knowledge. It has been frequently taken in this sense as the A B C of religious knowledge (so recently Mey., Lightf., Ol., Cremer and many others). This explanation had, however, been attacked by Neander with powerful arguments in his discussion of the parallel passage Gal. iv. 3. (*Planting and Training*, i., 465, 466, *cf.* 323 [Bohn's ed.].) He pointed out that if **στ.** meant first principles we should have had a genitive of the object, as in Heb. v. 12, **στ. τ. ἀρχῆς τ. λογίων.** Such an omission of the leading idea is inadmissible. Further, Paul regarded the heathen as enslaved under **στ. τ. κόσ.** and their falling away to Jewish rites as a return to this slavery. Therefore the expression must apply to something both had in common, and something condemned by Paul, which cannot be the first principles of religion (to which also **ἀσθενῆ** would be inappropriate), but the ceremonial observances, which were so called as earthly and material. It has been further pointed out by Klöpper that following **κατὰ τ. παρ. τ. ἀνθρ.** this term introduced by **κατὰ** and not connected by **καὶ** must express the content of the teaching, which is not very suitable if "religious rudiments" is the meaning. Nor is it true that the false teachers gave elementary instruction. If this view be set aside, as suiting neither the expression in itself nor the context in which it occurs, the question arises whether we should return to the interpretation of several Fathers, that the heavenly bodies are referred to. These were called **στοιχεῖα** (examples are given in Valesius on *Eus. H. E.*, v., 24, Hilg. *l.c.*). This is favoured by the reference to "days, and months, and seasons, and years" in Gal. iv. 11, immediately following the mention of **στ.** in ver. 10, for these were regulated by the heavenly bodies. But it is unsatisfactory, for the context in which the expression occurs, especially in Galatians, points to personal beings. In this passage the contrast of **στ. τ. κ.** with **Χριστόν** is fully satisfied only if the former are personal. In Gal. iv. 3 Paul applies the illustration of the heir under "guardians and stewards" to the pre-Christian world under the **στ. τ. κ.**, and here again a personal reference is forcibly suggested. Still more is this the case with Gal. iv. 8, 9. In ver. 8 Paul says **ἐδουλεύσατε τοῖς φύσει μὴ οὖσι θεοῖς.** In the next verse he asks "how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly **στ.**, to which you wish to be in bondage (**δουλεῦσαι**) over again?" This clearly identifies **τ. στ.** with **τ. φύσ. μὴ οὖσι θεοῖς**, and therefore proves their personality, which is suggested also by **ἐδουλ.**; accordingly they cannot be the heavenly bodies or the physical elements of the world. Hilgenfeld, followed

by Lipsius, Holsten and Klöpper, regards them as the astral spirits, the angels of the heavenly bodies. That the latter were regarded as animated by angels is certain, for we find this belief in Philo and Enoch (*cf.* Job xxxviii. 7, Jas. i. 17). But it is strange that the spirits of the stars should be called **στ. τ. κόσμου.** And while they determine the seasons and festivals, they have nothing to do with many ceremonial observances, such as abstinence from meats and drinks. Spitta (followed by Everling, Sod., Haupt, and apparently Abb.) has the merit of giving the true interpretation. According to the later Jewish theology, not only the stars but all things had their special angels. The proof of this belongs to a discussion of angelology, and must be assumed here. **στ. τ. κόσ.** are therefore the elemental spirits which animate all material things. They are so called from the elements which they animate, and are identical with the **ἀρχαὶ κ. ἐξουσίαι,** who receive this name from their sphere of authority. Thus all the abstinence from material things, submission to material ordinances and so forth, involve a return to their service. We need not, with Ritschl, limit the reference to the angels of the law, though they are included. Thus interpreted the passage gains its full relevance to the context, and to the angel worship of the false teachers which Paul is attacking. The chief objection to this explanation is that we have no parallel for this usage of the word, except in the *Test. Sol.*, **ἡμεῖς ἐσμὲν τὰ λεγόμενα στοιχεῖα, οἱ κοσμοκράτορες τοῦ κόσμου τούτου.** But this is late. The term is used in this sense in modern Greek. In spite of this the exegetical proof that personal beings are meant is too strong to be set aside. So we must explain, "philosophy having for its subject-matter the elemental spirits".—**καὶ οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν** must be taken similarly, not having Christ for its subject-matter. **Χ.** means the person of Christ, not teaching about Christ, and is opposed simply to **στ.,** not to **παρ. τ. ἀνθρ.** The false teachers put these angels in the place of Christ.

Ver. 9. **ὅτι** is connected by Bleek and Meyer with **οὐ κατὰ Χ.,** but it is much more probable that it should be connected with the whole warning introduced by **βλέπετε.** The false teachers represented the fulness of the Godhead as distributed among the angels, and thus led their victims captive. Paul's warning against the false doctrine thus rests on the fact that it was in Christ that the whole fulness dwelt.—**ἐν αὐτῷ** is emphatic, in Him and in Him alone.—**κατοικεῖ**: "permanently dwells". The reference is to the Exalted State, not only on account of the present, but of the context and Paul's Christology generally.—**πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος**: "all the fulness of the Godhead". **πᾶν** is emphatic, the whole fulness dwells in Christ, therefore it is vain to seek it wholly or partially outside of Him. **πλ. τ. θ.** is not to be taken (as by Ol.) to mean the perfection of Divinity, *i.e.*, ideal holiness. Nor can it mean the Church, for which Eph. i. 23 gives no support, nor yet the universe, either of which must have been very differently expressed. The addition of **θεότητος** defines **πλ.** as the fulness of Deity. The word is to be distinguished from **θειότης** as Deity, the being God, from Divinity, the being Divine or Godlike. The passage thus asserts the real Deity of Christ.—**σωματικῶς.** This word is very variously interpreted. The reference is usually taken to be to the glorified body of Christ, or (as by Lightf.) to the Incarnation, and the word is translated "in bodily fashion". Apart from the question whether the word naturally expresses this, there is the difficulty caused by the contrast implied in its emphatic position. This contrast is sometimes thought to be to the pre-incarnate state, but this has no relevance here. A contrast to the angels might be in point, but they were closely connected with bodies, so the contrast in this respect did not exist. But neither is Soden's view that while the angels have bodies what is expressed in them is only **θειότης** (Rom. i. 20) not **πλ. τ. θεότητος,** a tenable explanation, since this is just read into the words, not elicited from them; nor could such a distinction have occurred to the readers. This interpretation of **σωμ.,** then, as expressing the indwelling of the fulness in a body, although said by Abbott to be "the only one tenable," is encumbered with grave difficulties, and has been rejected by several commentators. Many have taken it to mean "really" (recently Bleek, Kl., Everling, Cremer). This is supported by the contrast of **σῶμα** with **σκιά** in ver. 17, the indwelling is real and not shadowy or typical. But **σωματικῶς** could hardly express this shade of meaning unless the antithesis was expressed. Oltramare translates "personally, in His person". But he quotes no instances of the adverb, but only of **σῶμα.** And Haupt's criticism is just, that this sense might suggest that in God Himself it dwelt impersonally. After an elaborate examination of the

h Only here, 2 Cor. v. 1; Mark xiv. 58 in class. or Bib. Gk.

κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς [e]θεότητος [e]σωματικῶς, 10. καὶ ἐστὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι, ὅς [1] ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας, 11. ἐν ᾧ καὶ περιετμήθητε περιτομῇ [h]ἀχειροποιήτῳ ἐν τῇ [f]ἀπεκδύσει

[1] So T., Tr., W.H., R.V., Ws. with ℵACKLP. ο: Ln., Tr. mg. with BDFG 47*, by dropping out of ς before εσ.

various views, Haupt puts forward the explanation that σωματ. relates to τ. πλ. τ. θ., and is to be translated "in the form of a body". The meaning he takes to be that the fulness exists in Christ as a body, that is as a complete and organic whole. This suits the context and the general argument better than the reference to Christ's own body. In contrast to the distribution of the fulness among the angels, or to the view that it dwelt only partially in Him, Paul insists that all the fulness dwells in Him, and not fragmentarily but as an organic whole. This view, like Oltramare's, is supported only by references to the use of σῶμα. This is not a fatal objection, and its harmony with the context makes it the most probable interpretation.

Ver. 10. **καὶ ἐστὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι.** This still depends on ὅτι. ἐστὲ is obviously not an imperative. We should, perhaps, reject the view of Ellicott and Lightfoot that there are two predicates. The thoughts thus obtained that they are in Him, and that they are made full, are true in themselves. But, as Abbott points out, the context requires the emphasis to be thrown on the ἐν αὐτῷ, so that the sense is "and it is in Him that ye are made full". πεπλ. is chosen on account of πλήρωμα in ver. 9, but we cannot explain it as filled with the Godhead, because such an equalising of Christians with their Lord would have been impossible to Paul, and would have required καὶ ὑμεῖς to express it. This meets Oltramare's objection to the translation adopted. He says that if πεπλ. means filled, they must be filled with something, but since the most obvious explanation that they are filled with the fulness of the Godhead is so largely rejected, it is clear that the translation breaks down. He translates "in Him you are perfect," and urges that this also overthrows the usual interpretation of πλήρ. τ. θεότ. But apart from the fact that πλήρωμα does not mean moral perfection, τῆς θεότ. cannot be supplied. What Paul means is that in Christ they find the satisfaction of every spiritual want. It therefore follows of itself that they do not need the angelic powers.—**ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας**: *cf.* i. 18. That Christ is the Head of every principality and power is a further reason why they should not seek to them. All they need they have in Christ. Paul does not mention here the thrones or lordships as in i. 16. But it is a questionable inference that they, unlike the principalities and powers, had no place in the false teaching. The latter are probably adduced only as examples.

Ver. 11. The reference to circumcision seems to come in abruptly. But probably it stands in close connexion with what has gone before. For the return to the principalities and powers in ver. 15 shows that Paul is not passing here to a new section of his subject. Judaism, of which circumcision was the most characteristic feature, was regarded as under angelic powers, and the removal of them meant its abolition. It seems probable that the false teachers set a high value on circumcision, and urged it on the Colossians, not as indispensable to salvation, in which case Paul would have definitely attacked them on this point, but as conferring a higher sanctity. There seems to be no suggestion that it was regarded as a charm against evil spirits. The Apostle does not merely leave them with the statement that they have been made full in Christ, which rendered circumcision unnecessary, but adds that they have already received circumcision, not material but spiritual, not the removal of a fragment of the body, but the complete putting off of the body of flesh.—**ἐν ᾧ καὶ περιετμήθητε.** A definite historical fact is referred to, as is shown by the aorist. This was their conversion, the inward circumcision of the heart, by which they entered on the blessings of the New Covenant. The outward sign of this is baptism, with which Paul connects it in the next verse. But it cannot be identified with it, for it is not made with hands. The circumcision of the heart is a prophetic idea (Deut. x. 16, xxx. 6, Jer. iv. 4, ix. 25, Ezek. xliv. 7, 9). In Paul it occurs Rom. ii. 28, 29, Phil. iii. 3.—**περιτομῇ ἀχειροποιήτῳ**: "with a

τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός, ἐν τῇ περιτομῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 12. [i] συνταφέντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτισμῷ,[1] ἐν ᾧ καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως

[i] Only here and Rom. vi. 4 in Bib. Gk.

[1] So Ln. mg., Tr., Lft., Ws. with ℵcBD*FG 47, 71. βαπτισματι: T., W.H. with ℵ*ACDcEKLP, by alteration to more usual form.

circumcision not wrought by hands," *i.e.*, spiritual, ethical (*cf.* Eph. ii. 11, **οἱ λεγόμενοι ἀκροβυστία ὑπὸ τῆς λεγομένης περιτομῆς ἐν σαρκὶ χειροποιήτου**).—**ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός**: "in the stripping from you of the body of the flesh". The expression **σῶμα τ. σαρκὸς** is unusual. It means the body which consists of flesh, and of flesh as the seat of sin. By the removal of the home in which sin dwelt sin itself was removed. It is one of those cases in which the sense of **σῶμα** approximates to that of **σάρξ**. This body of flesh is removed from the Christian at his conversion.—**ἐν τῇ περιτομῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ**. This cannot be the circumcision endured by Christ in His infancy, for that was wrought by hands, and such a reference would be most unfortunate for the polemic against ceremonies and altogether un-Pauline. Usually it is explained as the circumcision of our hearts which comes from Christ. But this has no parallel in the N.T.; further, it practically repeats **ἐν ᾧ κ. περιετ.**; and, coming between the removal of the body of the flesh and the burial with Christ, breaks the connexion. Accordingly Schneckenburger (followed by Kl., Sod., Haupt) suggested that it was really an expression for the death of Christ. (His view that **ἀπεκ. τ. σ. τ. σ.** was to be taken similarly has met with no acceptance.) In favour of this it may be said that in the immediate context Paul goes on to speak of burial and resurrection with Christ, and a reference to the death would naturally precede. And circumcision is a happy metaphor for Christ's death to sin (Rom. vi. 10). Meyer's objection that it is inappropriate since Christ endured actual circumcision is not serious, for, if sound, it should have excluded the choice of these ambiguous words altogether, which naturally suggest a circumcision suffered by Christ. But what creates a grave difficulty is that the thought does not seem to run on connectedly. There is a transition from the death of Christ on the cross to the burial of Christians with Him in their own personal experience. Perhaps this interpretation involves taking **περιετμήθητε** of the death of Christians with Christ on the cross (2 Cor. v. 14), for it doubles the difficulty if Paul passes from the personal experience of the Christian to the cross, and from the cross back to personal experience. This suggests the possibility that **περ. Χ.** might be interpreted on the analogy of **θλίψεων τ. Χριστοῦ** (i. 24) as the circumcision of Christ in the believer. This would give a good connexion, and one that would suit the apparent identification of the circumcision of Christ with the putting off of the body of the flesh. The phrase, however, is so strange, and the idea that Christ dies with us so questionable (we die with Him), that it seems unsafe to adopt it. It is, therefore, best to mitigate the difficulty by the view that in these words Paul interpolates, in a concise and obscure expression, a reference to the great fact which underlay the spiritual experiences of which he is speaking. This circumcision, he would say, that is the removal of the flesh, was first experienced by Christ on the cross, and what happened to you ideally then is realised though union with Him now.

Ver. 12. **συνταφέντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτισμῷ**. This refers to the personal experience of the Christian. The rite of baptism, in which the person baptised was first buried beneath the water and then raised from it, typified to Paul the burial and resurrection of the believer with Christ. Burial seems to imply a previous death, but Rom. vi. 3, 4 perhaps shows that the metaphors must not be rigidly pressed. **συνταφ.** is to be joined closely with **περιετμήθητε**. If any distinction in meaning is to be made between **βαπτισμός** and **βάπτισμα**, it is that the former expresses the process, the latter the result.—**ἐν ᾧ** may refer either to **Χρ.** or to **βαπ.** The former view is taken by Chrysostom (followed by Luther, Meyer and many others). The latter is taken by Calvin and most recent commentators (De W., Hofm., Alf., Ell., Lightf., Kl., Sod., Haupt, Abb.). In favour of the former it is urged that the parallelism with **ἐν ᾧ καὶ περιετμ.** requires it. But the real parallel is with "buried with Him in baptism," and this requires "raised with Him in baptism". Since baptism is not the mere plunging into the water, but emersion from it too, **ἐν** is not against this interpretation,

τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ τῶν[1] νεκρῶν· 13. καὶ
k Not class., only Paul in N.T., exc. Acts xi. 3.
l Only here and Eph. ii. 5 (par.) in class. or Bib. Gk.
ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας τοῖς παραπτώμασιν[2] καὶ τῇ [k]ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς
σαρκὸς ὑμῶν [l]συνεζωοποίησεν ὑμᾶς[3] σὺν αὐτῷ, χαρισάμενος ἡμῖν

[1] So Ln., Tr. [Lft.], R.V., Ws. with BDEFG 17. **των**: omitted by T., W.H. with ℵACKLP, in conformity with more common usage.

[2] So T., Tr., W.H., Ws. with ℵBL 17. **εν τοις παραπτωμασιν**: Ln. with ℵ[a]ACDEFGKP.

[3] So edd. with ℵ*ACKL. **υμας**: omitted by ℵ[c]DEFGP, to avoid repetition. **ημας**: W.H. mg. with B 17, 37, under influence of **ημιν**.

and **διά** or **ἐξ** is not necessary to express it. — **συνηγέρθητε** expresses the positive side of the experience. That death with Christ, which is the putting off of the body of flesh, has for its counterpart the putting on of Christ (Gal. iii. 27), which is followed by a walk with Him in newness of life. It is true that our complete redemption is attained only in the resurrection of the body (Rom. viii. 23, 2 Cor. v. 2-4). But there is clearly no reference here to the bodily resurrection at the last day, as some have thought; for that is altogether excluded by the whole tenor of the passage, which refers to an experience already complete. Nor can we, with Meyer, think of the bodily resurrection as already ideally accomplished in baptism. For the preceding context speaks only of a spiritual experience, and it is impossible to pass thus violently to one that is physical. Haupt agrees with this, but thinks the reference is not ethical, but religious, that is forensic. The rest of the passage, he argues, shows that it is not moral transformation, but justification, that Paul has in mind. But however true this may be of **χαρισάμενος . . . σταυρῷ**, it is at least questionable for the immediately succeeding context. And since the union covers both ethical renewal and justification, it is natural to find both mentioned in connexion with it, and to hold fast the former here as the more natural interpretation of the words.—**διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας**: "through faith in the working". Klöpper (following Luth., Beng., De W. and others) makes **τῆς ἐνερ.** genitive of cause, "faith produced by the working". He argues that it is strange that in the experience already referred to the faith which proves itself in baptism must be thought of as directed towards the Person of Christ, and so cannot now be spoken of as faith in the working of God; and further, that the whole context has referred to a passive experience, and so this is fitly continued by the assertion that even the faith, which appropriates the death and resurrection of Christ, is the creation of God. But these arguments are insufficient to overthrow the force of Pauline usage, according to which elsewhere the genitive after **πίστις**, unless it refers to the person who believes, expresses the object of faith. The view of Hofmann that **τ. ἐνερ.** is a genitive of apposition, and that what is meant is "faith, that is the working of God," is quite out of the question. For faith directed towards the working of God who raised Christ from the dead, *cf.* Rom. iv. 24. God is so characterised, since the working by which He raised Christ will also be effective in our own spiritual experience. Our baptism is therefore not a sign of nothing, but of a real spiritual burial and resurrection with Christ.

Ver. 13. Partially parallel to Eph. ii. 1, 5.—**καὶ ὑμᾶς**: "and you". Frequently this is taken to mean "you also," *i.e.*, you Gentiles. But since Paul has been using the second person before, he can hardly be introducing a contrast. We should therefore take **καὶ** as simply copulative. It means "you as well as Christ," as is shown also by the verbal parallel between **ἐκ τ. νεκρῶν** and **νεκροὺς ὄντας**. —**νεκροὺς**. Here Paul varies the sense of death. In the preceding verses it is death to the old life, here the old life itself is described as a condition of spiritual death. It is not of liability to eternal death (Mey.), or to physical death as the certain consequence of sin that he is speaking, but of a state of actual death, which can only be spiritual (*cf.* "sin revived and I died," Rom. vii. 9). —**τοῖς παραπτώμασιν**: "by your trespasses". The dative is probably one of cause, but it could be translated by

πάντα τὰ παραπτώματα, 14. ἐξαλείψας τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν [m] χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασιν, ὃ ἦν [n] ὑπεναντίον ἡμῖν, καὶ αὐτὸ ἦρκεν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου,

m Only here and Tob. v. 3, ix. 5 in Bib. Gk.

n Only here and Heb. x. 27 in N.T.

"in". παραπτ. are individual acts of transgression, of which ἁμαρτία is the principle.—τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ της σαρκὸς ὑμῶν: "by the uncircumcision of your flesh". This is often supposed to refer to literal uncircumcision, *i.e.*, to the fact that they were Gentiles. But we have already seen that there is no emphasis on this fact. And the implied contrast that Jews were not, while Gentiles were, spiritually dead, is impossible in Paul. He cannot have said that they were dead by reason of uncircumcision, and, if the dative is taken otherwise, yet the coupling of τῇ ἀκρ. with τ. παραπτ. shows that physical uncircumcision is not referred to, but an ethical state. And this would not, as Abbott thinks, be unintelligible to Gentile readers, for he had already explained the metaphor in ver. 11. τ. σαρκὸς is accordingly to be taken as an epexegetical genitive, "the uncircumcision which consisted in your flesh".—συνεζωοποίησεν: to be taken in the same sense as συνηγέρθητε, not in any of the senses wrongly attributed to that word, which are reintroduced here. Chrysostom (followed by Ew., Ell.) makes Christ the subject. This is defended by Ellicott on the ground of the prominence of Christ through the passage, of the difficulty of supplying Θεός from Θεοῦ, and of referring the acts in vv. 14, 15 to the Father. But this last difficulty, urged also by Lightfoot, rests on a probably wrong interpretation of ver. 15. Neither of the others is of any weight against the argument from Pauline usage, which always refers such actions to God. This view would also involve the awkwardness of making Christ raise Himself and us with Him, whereas in ver. 12 His resurrection is referred to God. It is therefore best to regard ὁ Θεός as the subject, as in the parallel Eph. ii. 4, 5.—χαρισάμενος: "forgiving". Forgiveness is contemporary with quickening.—ἡμῖν: the change from the second person may be due to Paul's wish gratefully to acknowledge his own participation in this blessing. It must not (with Hofm.) be referred to Jewish Christians.

Ver. 14. Partially parallel to Eph. ii. 15. Apparently Paul now passes to the historic fact which supplied the ground for the forgiveness. χαρισ. therefore refers to the subjective appropriation of the objective blotting out of the bond in the death of Christ.—ἐξαλείψας: "having blotted out," *i.e.*, having cancelled.—τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασιν. The original sense of χειρόγ. is handwriting, but it had come to mean a bond or note of hand. It is generally agreed that the reference here is to the Law (*cf.* Eph. ii. 15, τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν). That those under the Law did not write the Law has been pressed against this. It is true that χειρόγ. means strictly a bond given by the debtor in writing. It is not necessary, with Chrysostom and many others, to meet the objection by reference to the promise of the people in Exod. xxiv. 3. There is no need to press rigidly this detail of the metaphor. It is disputed in what sense we are to take the reference to the Law. Some (including Lightf., Ol., Sod., Abb.) think it embraces the Mosaic Law and the law written in the hearts of Gentiles. It is quite possible, however, that καθ' ἡμῶν means simply against us Jews. But, apart from this, the addition of τ. δογ. points to formulated commandment. This is confirmed by Eph. ii. 15, where the similar expression is used, not of what Jews and Gentiles had in common, but that which created the separation between them, *viz.*, the Jewish Law. Whether, with Calvin, Klöpper and Haupt, we should still further narrow the reference to the ceremonial Law is very questionable. It is true that circumcision and laws of meat and drink and sacred seasons are the chief forms that the "bond" takes. And it might make the interpretation of ver. 15 a little easier to regard the ceremonial as that part of the Law specially given by angels. But this distinction between the moral and ceremonial Law has no meaning in Paul. The Law is a unity and is done away as a whole. And for Paul the hostile character of the Law is peculiarly associated with the moral side of it. The law which slew him is illustrated by the tenth commandment, and the ministry of death was engraved on tablets of stone. It was the moral elements in the Law that made it the strength of sin. It is not certain how τοῖς δόγμασιν should be taken. Frequently it is interpreted "consisting in decrees". For this we ought

o Only here in N.T. προσηλώσας αὐτὸ τῷ σταυρῷ, 15. p ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ
p Only here and iii. 9 in class. or Bib. Gk. τὰς ἐξουσίας q ἐδειγμάτισεν[1] ἐν παρρησίᾳ r θριαμβεύσας αὐτοὺς ἐν
αὐτῷ.
q Only here and Matt. i. 19 in class. or Bib. Gk.
r Only here and 2 Cor. ii. 14 in class. or Bib. Gk.

[1] So Ln., T., Tr., W.H., R.V. with all authorities except B. **και εδειγματισεν**: Ws. with B.

to have had **τὸ ἐν δόγ.** Ellicott says this construction "seems distinctly ungrammatical". Others (including Mey., Lightf., Sod., Haupt, Abb.) connect closely with **χειρόγ.**, in such a way that the dative is governed by **γεγραμμένον** implied in **χειρόγ.** This is questionable in point of grammar. Winer says: "Meyer's explanation, *that which was written with the commandments* (the dative being used as in the phrase *written with letters*), is the more harsh, as **χειρόγραφον** has so completely established itself in usage as an independent word that it is hardly capable of governing (like **γεγραμμένον**) such a dative as this". (Winer-Moulton, p. 275; *cf.* also Ellicott *ad loc.*) It seems best then (with De W., Ell., Kl., Ol.) to translate "the handwriting which was against us by its ordinances". For this we should have expected **τ. καθ' ἡμ. τ. δόγ. χειρόγ.** or **τ. τοῖς δόγ. καθ' ἡμ. χειρόγ.**; but this seems to be the best way of taking the text as it stands, and perhaps the position of **τ. δόγ.** is for emphasis. The Greek commentators, followed by Bengel, explained the passage to mean having blotted out the Law by the doctrines of the Gospel. But **δόγ.** is a most un-Pauline, because legalist, expression for the Gospel, and by itself could not mean Christian doctrines. Nor is the sense it gives Pauline, for it was not by the teaching of the Gospel, but by the death of Christ, that the Law was done away. Erasmus' view (followed by Hofm.) that **τ. δόγ.** should be connected with what follows is very improbable.—**ὃ ἦν ὑπεναντίον ἡμῖν**: stronger than **καθ' ἡμῶν**, asserting not merely that the bond had a claim against us, but that it was hostile to us, the suggestion being that we could not meet its claim. No idea of secret hostility is present.—**καὶ αὐτὸ ἦρκεν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου.** "And it He hath taken out of the midst." The change from aorist to perfect is significant, as expressing the abiding character of the abolition. Lightfoot thinks that a change of subject takes place here, from God to Christ. His reason is that Christ must be the subject of **ἀπεκδ.**, since "no grammatical meaning can be assigned to **ἀπεκδυσάμενος**, by which it could be understood of God the Father". Since, however, no change of subject is hinted at in the passage, and would involve great difficulty, it is more reasonable to conclude that an interpretation which requires Christ to be the subject of **ἀπεκδ.** is self-condemned.—**προσηλώσας αὐτὸ τῷ σταυρῷ**: "having nailed it to the cross". When Christ was crucified, God nailed the Law to His cross. Thus it, like the flesh, was abrogated, sharing His death. The bond therefore no longer exists for us. To explain the words by reference to a custom of driving a nail through documents to cancel them, is not only to call in a questionable fact (see Field, *Notes on Transl. of the N.T.*, p. 196), but to dilute in the most tasteless way one of Paul's most striking and suggestive phrases. Quite on a level with it is Field's own suggestion as to "this seemingly superfluous addition" (!) that the reference is to the custom of hanging up spoils of war in temples. Zahn (*Einl. in das N.T.*, i., 335) draws a distinction between what was written on the bond and was blotted out by God, and the bond itself which was nailed to the cross and taken out of the way. We thus have two thoughts expressed: the removal of guilt incurred by transgression of the Law, and the abolition of the Law itself. It is questionable if this distinction is justified. The object is the same, **αὐτὸ** simply repeats **χειρόγραφον.**

Ver. 15. In this difficult verse the meaning of almost every word is disputed. It is therefore imperative to control the exegesis by strict regard to the context. The main question relates to the character of the principalities and powers. Subordinate questions are raised as to the subject of the sentence and the meaning of **ἀπεκδ.** The context before and after (**οὖν**, ver. 16) requires us to bring the interpretation into close connexion with the main thought, the abolition of the Law.—**ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας.** Till recently the

principalities and powers have been explained as hostile demoniacal spirits, and this view is held by Meyer, Ellicott, Lightfoot, Oltramare and Weiss. In its favour is the impression made by the verse that a victory over the powers is spoken of. How far this is so can be determined only by an examination of the terms employed. Against this view the following objections seem decisive. **ἀρχ. κ. ἐξ.** occur several times in the Epistle, but nowhere in this sense. In Eph. vi. 12 the reference to evil spirits is definitely and repeatedly fixed by the context. This is not so here. Further, the connexion with the context is difficult to trace. Bengel says: "Qui angelos bonos colebant, iidem malos timebant: neutrum jure". Weiss expresses a somewhat similar idea: "It seems that the Colossian theosophists threatened the readers that they would again fall under the power of evil spirits if they did not submit to their discipline". But not only have we no evidence for this, but this interpretation cuts the nerve of the passage, which is the abolition of the Law by the cross. Meyer's view is more relevant: the Law is done away in Christ, and since it is the strength of sin, sin's power is thus broken, and so is the devil's power, which is exercised only through sin. Gess interprets that the Law through its curse created separation between men and God, and thus gave a point of support for the dominion of evil spirits. "Of this handwriting have they boasted. Our guilt was their strength. He who sees the handwriting nailed to the cross can mock these foes." But these views are read into the passage, and do not lead up to ver. 16. And where the Jewish Law was absent, as in the heathen world, sin was rampant. Ellicott and Lightfoot do not attempt to trace a connexion with the context, nor on their view of **ἀπεκδ.** is one possible. All this strongly suggests that we should give another sense to **ἀρχ. κ. ἐξ.** And this is secured if we identify them with **ἀρχ. κ. ἐξ.** already mentioned (i. 16 and ii. 10). In favour of this are the following considerations: (1) Unless we are warned to the contrary it is natural to keep the same meaning throughout. (2) We thus get a thought that perfectly suits the context. This law that has been abolished was given by angels, its abolition implies their degradation. To them was also subject the whole of the observances of eating, drinking, etc. (3) It is a powerful polemic against the worship of angels (ver. 18), which is lost on the other view. In effect Paul says, "You are worshipping angels who were degraded when Christ was crucified". We may therefore take **ἀρχ. κ. ἐξ**, as in the rest of the Epistle, as angelic powers, identical with **στοιχεῖα τ. κόσμου**, and holding a special relation to the Law. The next question is as to the meaning of **ἀπεκδ.** The translation "having put off His body" may be safely set aside, for Paul must have said this if he had meant it. The Greek commentators, followed by Ellicott and Lightfoot, interpret "having put off from Himself". The word is used in this sense in iii. 9. They explain that Christ divested Himself of the powers of evil that gathered about Him, since He assumed our humanity with all its temptations. But (apart from the change of subject) the change of metaphor is very awkward from stripping off adversaries, like clothes, to exhibiting and triumphing over them. More cogent is the objection caused by the strangeness of the idea. Christ wore our human nature with its liability to temptation. But that He wore evil spirits is a different and indeed most objectionable idea. The same translation is adopted by some who take the other view of **ἀρχ. κ. ἐξ.**, and the explanation given is that God in the death of Christ divested Himself of angelic mediators. This is free from the impropriety of the other view, but shares its incongruity of metaphor. The more usual translation is "spoiled". The middle can mean "stripped for Himself," and this again suits either view of **ἀρχ. κ. ἐξ.** If evil spirits, they are stripped of their dominion; but if angels of the Law, they are despoiled of the dominion they exercise. This view, though stigmatised by Zahn as "an inexcusable caprice," is probably best. They are fallen potentates. There is no need to worship them, or to fear their vengeance, if their commands are disobeyed. With the true interpretation of this passage, every reason disappears for assuming that Christ is the subject.—**ἐδειγμάτισεν ἐν παρρησίᾳ.** "He made a show of them openly." No exhibition in disgrace is necessarily implied. The principalities and powers are exhibited in their true position of inferiority, as mediators of an abolished Law and rulers of elements to which Christians have died. **ἐν παρ.** is not to be translated "boldly," for courage is not needed to exhibit those who are spoiled. The word is contrasted with "reserve," and indicates the frank, open exhibition of the angels in their true position when the bond was cancelled and

16. Μὴ οὖν τις ὑμᾶς κριν[s]έτω ἐν [s]πόσει[1] ἢ ἐν μέρει [t]ἑορτῆς ἢ [o]νεομηνίας ἢ [u]σαββάτων, 17. ὅ[2] ἐστιν [v]σκιὰ τῶν μελ-

s Only here and Rom. xiv. 17; John vi. 55 in N.T. in Paul. t Only here in Paul. o Only here and 1 Cor. xvi. 2 in Paul. u Only here and 1 Cor. xvi. 2 in Paul. v Heb. x. 1; only here

[1] So Tr. mg., W.H.; Ws. with B cop., Or. **η εν ποσει**: Ln., T., W.H. mg. with ℵACDEFGKLP, through assimilation to following words.

[2] So Ln., W.H. mg., Ws. with BFG. **α**: T., W.H., R.V. with ℵACDEKLP, on account of enumeration in ver. 16.

Christ was manifested as the final revelation of God.—**θριαμβεύσας.** This seems to express most definitely that the **ἀρχ. κ. ἐξ.** are hostile powers. Alford, referring to 2 Cor. ii. 14, says the true victory is our defeat by Him. Findlay thinks the reference in the verb (which is not earlier than Paul) is not to the Roman military triumph, but to the festal procession (**θρίαμβος**) of the worshippers of Dionysus. In this case God is represented as leading the angels in procession in His honour; in other words, bringing them to acknowledge His greatness and the revelation of Himself in Christ. It is perhaps safest to translate "triumphing over". This is favoured by other passages in Paul, which imply that the **ἀρχ. κ. ἐξ.** needed an experience of this kind.—**ἐν αὐτῷ** may refer to **Χριστ.** or **σταυρ.** or **χειρόγ.** The second is best, for there has been no reference to Christ since ver. 13, and it is the cancelling of the bond, not the bond itself, that is the cause of the triumph. It is in the death of Christ that this triumph takes place. Zahn explains the passage to mean that God has stripped away the principalities and powers which concealed Him, not from the Jews, to whom He had revealed Himself, but from the heathen world. Thus He has revealed Himself and these apparent deities in their true character. He has triumphed over them in Christ, and led them vanquished in His train. But this was not accomplished on the cross, but through the preaching of the Gospel among the Gentiles, accompanied with such signs and wonders as in the story of the maid with the spirit of divination and the exorcists at Ephesus. But this is not what is required by the argument, which has the Jewish Law in view.

Vv. 16-23. SINCE THE LAW HAS BEEN CANCELLED AND THE ANGELS DESPOILED, RITUAL OR ASCETIC ORDINANCES HAVE NO LONGER ANY MEANING FOR THOSE WHO IN CHRIST POSSESS THE SUBSTANCE, OF WHICH THESE ARE BUT THE SHADOW. THEY MUST NOT BE INTIMIDATED BY ANGEL WORSHIPPERS, WHO ARE PUFFED UP BY FLESHLY CONCEIT, AND ONLY LOOSELY HOLD THE HEAD, FROM WHOM THE BODY DRAWS ALL ITS SUPPLY. SINCE THEY HAVE DIED TO THE ELEMENTAL SPIRITS, THEY MUST NOT SUBMIT TO THE PRECEPTS OF ASCETICISM, WHATEVER REPUTATION FOR WISDOM THEY MAY CONFER.—Ver. 16. The connexion with the preceding argument is this: Since the bond written in ordinances has been abolished, and the angelic powers spoiled and led in triumph, allow no one to criticise your action on the ground that it is not in harmony with the precepts of the Law, or cuts you off from communion with the angels. You have nothing to do with Law or angels. At best they were but the shadow, and in Christ you possess the substance.—**κρινέτω ἐν**: "judge you in," **ἐν** meaning on the basis of. Whether a man eats or drinks or not his conduct in this respect supplies no fit ground for a judgment of him. **κρ.** is not to "condemn," though the context shows that unfavourable judgment is in Paul's mind. —**βρώσει καὶ ἐν πόσει**: "eating and in drinking," not food and drink, for which Paul would have used **βρῶμα** and **πόμα.** The question is not altogether between lawful and unlawful food, but between eating and drinking or abstinence. Asceticism rather than ritual cleanness is in his mind. The Law is not ascetic in its character, its prohibitions of meats rest on the view that they are unclean, and drinks are not forbidden, save in exceptional cases, and then not for ascetic reasons. But these injunctions stand along with ordinances of the Law itself, partly, because they may have been regarded as extensions of its principles, partly, we may suppose, because, like the Law, they were attributed to the angels by the false teachers. In Heb. ix. 10 regulations as to drinks seem to be referred to as part of the Jewish Law. That the false teachers were ascetics is clear from **ἀφειδίᾳ σώματος** in ver. 23. —**ἐν μέρει**: "in the matter of," **μέρ.**

λόντων, τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. 18. μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς [w]καταβραβευέτω θέλων ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ καὶ [x]θρησκείᾳ τῶν ἀγγέλων, ἃ [1] ἑόρακεν [z]ἐμβατεύων, εἰκῇ [y]φυσιούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ νοὸς τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ,

w Dem., *Mid.*, 544 (quotation from witnesses); Eustath., *ad Il.*, i., 402 ff. x Only here and Acts xxvi. 5; Jas. i. 26, 27 in N.T. y Only here and 1 Cor. (six times) in class. or Bib. Gk.

[1] So T., Tr., W.H., R.V., Ws. with ℵ*ABD* 17, 28, 67**. μη: inserted after α by [Ln.] with CKLP. ουκ: FG.

expressing the category. Chrysostom and some others have taken it strangely to mean "in the partial observance of". —**ἑορτῆς ἢ νεομηνίας ἢ σαββάτων**: the Jewish sacred seasons enumerated as they occur yearly, monthly and weekly. The Sabbath is placed on the same footing as the others, and Paul therefore commits himself to the principle that a Christian is not to be censured for its non-observance. **σαββ.**, though plural in form, means a single Sabbath day.

Ver. 17. This verse contains a hint of the fundamental argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews (*cf.* esp. Heb. viii. 5, x. 1). —**ὅ ἐστιν σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων.** Whether **ὅ** or **ἅ** be read, the reference is to the whole of the ceremonial ordinances just mentioned. **σκιὰ** is "shadow," not "sketch" (as Calvin and others). It is cast by the body, and therefore implies that there is a body, and while it resembles the body it is itself insubstantial. **τ. μελλ.** means the Christian dispensation, not (as Mey.) the still future Messianic kingdom, for, if so, the substance would still lie in the future, and the shadow would not be out of date. It is future from the point of view of Judaism. —**τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ**: "but the body belongs to Christ". **σῶμα** is that which casts the shadow, therefore it existed contemporaneously with its manifestation, and, of course, according to the Jewish view, in heaven. It practically means what we should call "the substance," and is chosen as the counterpart to **σκιὰ**, and with no reference to the Church or the glorified body of Christ. Since the substance belonged to Christ, it was foolish for Christians to hanker after the shadow. All that the most sanguine hoped to attain by asceticism and ceremonialism was possessed immediately in the possession of Christ.

Ver. 18. This verse gives us our only definite information, apart from which it would have been a highly probable inference, that the false teachers practised angel-worship. — **ὑμᾶς καταβραβευέτω.** This is commonly translated "rob you of your prize". The judge at the games was called **βραβεύς** or **βραβευτής**, and the prize **βραβεῖον.** But the verb **βραβεύω** apparently lost all reference to the prize, and meant simply "to decide". In the two cases in which **καταβραβεύω** occurs it means to decide against or condemn. It is best therefore to take it so here, "let no one give judgment against you"; it is thus parallel to, though stronger than, **κρινέτω** (ver. 16). (Field, *Notes on Transl. of the N.T.*, pp. 196, 197, discusses the word; *cf.* also Ol. and Abb. *ad loc.*)—**θέλων ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ.** This phrase is very variously interpreted. Some assume a Hebraism, and translate "taking pleasure in humility" (Winer, Lightf., Findl., Haupt). The LXX uses this not infrequently (but usually with persons, though otherwise in Ps. cxi. 1, cxlvi. 10); but there is no N.T. parallel for it, and Paul does not employ Hebraisms. For this idea he uses **εὐδοκεῖν.** Moreover it yields no relevant sense here. Others translate "wishing to do so in (*or* by) humility" (Mey., Ell., Sod., Weiss). But for this **τοῦτο ποιεῖν** should have been added, and on this interpretation **θέλων** has really little point. The rendering of Alford, Moule and others is not very different from this in sense, but more forcible. It connects **θέλ.** with **καταβραβ.**, and translates "wilfully," "of set purpose". 2 Pet. iii. 5 is referred to for the construction. Oltramare's view is similar, but he translates "spontaneously," so apparently the R.V. mg. and Abbott. The unsatisfactoriness of these interpretations suggests that the text may be corrupt. Hort thinks that for **θέλων ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ** we should read **ἐν ἐθελοταπεινοφροσύνῃ.** This word is used by Basil, and a similar compound occurs in ver. 23. It is, of course, as Haupt says, difficult to understand how the copyists should have altered it into the very strange expression in the text. But this is not a fatal objection, and the conjecture is very possibly correct. It would mean "gratuitous humility," a humility that went beyond what was

z Only here and Eph. iv. 16 (par.) in N.T.

19. καὶ οὐ κρατῶν τὴν κεφαλήν, ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα διὰ τῶν [z]ἁφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ συνβιβαζόμενον αὔξει

required. ταπεινοφροσύνῃ is frequently explained as ironical. By a display of humility they beguiled their dupes. But the connexion with the following words makes this improbable. Their humility found an expression in angel worship. It is therefore that lowliness which causes a man to think himself unworthy to come into fellowship with God, and therefore prompts to worship of the angels. Such humility was perverted, but not therefore unreal. It was compatible with vanity towards others.—καὶ θρησκείᾳ τῶν ἀγγέλων: "and worship of angels". The genitive is objective, though some have taken it as subjective. This has been done most recently and elaborately by Zahn. He takes τ. ἀγγ. with ταπειν. as well as with θρησκείᾳ. The former noun is used, he argues, in a non-Pauline sense, therefore it needs a definition, and that τ. ἀγγ. is intended to define it is made probable by the fact that it is not repeated before θρησκ. What is meant is a mortification and devotion suitable for angels, but not for men who live in bodies, an attempt to assimilate themselves to angels, who do not eat or drink. The chief ground urged for this view is that Judaism was too strenuously monotheistic to admit of angel worship, and Paul could only have regarded it as idolatry. Against this what is said in the *Introduction*, section ii., may be referred to. The angels worshipped by the false teachers are the στοιχεῖα τ. κόσμου, ἀρχαὶ κ. ἐξουσίαι.—ἃ ἑόρακεν ἐμβατεύων. If μὴ is inserted after ἃ, we may translate with Ellicott, in his earlier editions, "intruding into the things which he hath not seen". This should probably be explained with reference to the invisible world, with which they professed to hold communion, but which really was closed to them. Ellicott still thinks this reading gives the better sense, though adopting the other in deference to the external evidence. But Paul could hardly have brought it against them that they had fellowship with what they could not see. For this was so with all who walked by faith. The negative, therefore, is not helpful to the sense, and is definitely excluded by the external evidence. The text without the negative is very variously explained. ἐμβατεύειν means "to stand upon," then "to come into possession of" a thing, "to enter upon," "to invade," then in a figurative sense "to investigate". Since ἃ ἑόρακεν also lends itself to diametrically opposite interpretations, the exegesis becomes doubly uncertain. It may mean the things which can be seen with the bodily eye, or it may refer to visions; they may be condemned as deluded visionaries, or for their materialism. Alford and Ellicott translate "taking his stand on the things which he hath seen," and explain that he becomes an inhabitant of the world of sight rather than of faith. But the use of the perfect is against any reference to the circumstances of ordinary life, and the thought would have been far more simply and clearly expressed by τὰ ὁρατά. Generally it is supposed that "the things which he has seen" means his visions. Various views are then taken of ἐμβατεύων. Meyer translates "entering upon what he has beheld," and explains that, instead of holding fast to Christ, he enters the region of visions. Several translate "investigating" (Beng., Grimm, Findl., Ol., Haupt). This is probably the best translation of the words as they stand, for the translation "parading his visions" (Sod. and ? Abb.) seems not to be well established. The harshness of the combination, and uncertainty of the exegesis, give much probability to the view that the text has not been correctly transmitted. After it had been conjectured that we should read ἃ ἑώρα κενεμβατεύων, Lightfoot independently suggested the latter word, but for ἃ ἑώρα suggested ἐώρᾳ or αἰώρᾳ. [Sod. incorrectly quotes the emendation as αἰῶρα; and in Abb. by a misprint we have αἰώρα. Ellicott not only misreports Lightfoot's emendation, but does not even mention Taylor's.] ἐώρα is used sometimes of that which suspends a thing, sometimes of the act of suspension. "In this last sense," Lightfoot says, "it describes the poising of a bird, the floating of a boat on the waters, the balancing on a rope, and the like. Hence its expressiveness when used as a metaphor." κενεμβατεύειν does not actually occur, but the cognate verb κενεμβατεῖν is not uncommon. A much better emendation, however, is that of Dr. C. Taylor (*Journal of Philology*, vii., p. 130), ἀέρα κενεμβατεύων, "treading the void of air". In his *Pirqe Aboth*,[2] p. 161, he says that the Rabbinic expression

τὴν [2]αὔξησιν τοῦ Θεοῦ. 20. εἰ ἀπεθάνετε σὺν Χριστῷ ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ κόσμου, τί ὡς ζῶντες ἐν κόσμῳ [3]δογματίζεσθε,

"fly in the air with nothing to rest upon" may have suggested the phrase to Paul. This emendation is accepted by Westcott and Hort, and regarded as the most probable by Zahn, who says that the text as it stands yields no sense. It involves the omission of a single letter, and although the province of conjectural emendation in the New Testament is very restricted, yet such a slip as is suggested may very easily have been made by Paul's amanuensis or a very early copyist. Field urges as a fatal objection that "**κενεμβατεύων** is a *vox nulla*, the inviolable laws regulating this class of composite verbs stamping **κενεμβατεῖν** as the only legitimate, as it is the only existing, form" (*loc. cit.*, p. 198). Lightfoot, on the contrary, asserts that it is unobjectionable in itself. Even if Field's criticism be admitted, it would be better to read **ἀέρα κενεμβατῶν** than to retain the text. If the emendation is correct, Paul is asserting the baseless character of the false teaching; and all reference to visions disappears. — **εἰκῇ** should probably, in accordance with Pauline usage, be connected with the following rather than the preceding words. It may mean "groundlessly" (Mey., Alf., Ell., Ol., Haupt, Abb.) or "without result" (Sod. and others). The latter is the sense in Gal. iii. 4, iv. 11, 1 Cor. xv. 2, Rom. xiii. 4, but, since it does not suit **φυσ.**, the former is to be preferred here.—**φυσιούμενος**: *cf.* 1 Cor. viii. 1 **ἡ γνῶσις φυσιοῖ**, xiii. 4. They were puffed up by a sense of spiritual and intellectual superiority.—**ὑπὸ τοῦ νοὸς τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ**: "by the mind of his flesh". The mind in this case is regarded as dominated by the flesh. Soden, followed by Abbott, says that the **νοῦς** as a natural faculty is ethically indifferent in itself, and so may stand just as well under the influence of **σάρξ** as of **πνεῦμα**. But in the most important passage, Rom. vii. 22-25, it is the higher nature in the unregenerate which wages unsuccessful conflict with the **σάρξ**. At the same time we see from Eph. iv. 17 that it could become vain and aimless and even (Rom. i. 28) reprobate. The choice of the phrase here is probably dictated by Paul's wish to drive home the fact that their asceticism and angel worship, so far from securing as they imagined the destruction of the flesh, proved that it was by the flesh that they were altogether controlled, even to the mind itself, which stood farthest from it.

Ver. 19. Largely parallel to Eph. iv. 15, 16. Paul proceeds to point out that so far from securing spiritual growth of a higher order, the false teaching, by loosening the hold on Christ, prevented any growth at all, since it obstructed or severed the very channel of spiritual life. —**καὶ οὐ κρατῶν τὴν κεφαλήν**: "and not holding fast the head". For this sense of **κρ.** with the accusative *cf.* Song of Songs iii. 4, **ἐκράτησα αὐτὸν καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκα αὐτόν.** It is clear from this that the false teachers were Christians. They did not profess to have no hold upon Christ, but their hold was not firm. All the supplies of life and energy flow from the Head, so that loose connexion with it involves serious loss and not progress in the spiritual life. It is significant that here each member is recognised as having an immediate relation to the Head.—**ἐξ οὗ**: not neuter, referring to **κεφ.**, for **ἐξ ἧς** would have been more natural, but "from whom". It should be connected with both participles.—**πᾶν τὸ σῶμα**; "the whole body". Alford takes it "the body in its every part," but Ellicott denies that any distinction between **τὸ πᾶν σῶμα** and **πᾶν τὸ σῶμα** can be safely drawn. It is the body as a whole that increases, and thus Paul condemns the tendencies to intellectual or spiritual exclusiveness, which cripple alike the body and the members who exhibit such tendencies. As this increase continues each member shares in the body's progress.—**διὰ τῶν ἁφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων.** Lightfoot gives a very full discussion of these terms and their use in medical writers. He translates "through the junctures and ligaments". No doubt Paul's language is popular, not technical. He is speaking of the means by which the various parts of the body are supplied and knit together. Meyer takes **ἁφ.** to mean sensations or nerve impulses, but we have no evidence for this meaning; nor is it suitable here, for there is no reason for referring **ἁφ.** to **ἐπιχορ.** and **συνδ.** to **συνβιβ.** No explanation is given of **ἁφ. κ. συνδ.** Some think of the Holy Spirit, others of brotherly love, others of ministers. But probably in Paul's mind they did not correspond to anything definitely. —**ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ συνβιβαζόμενον**:

21. Μὴ ἅψῃ μηδὲ γεύσῃ μηδὲ [a] θίγῃς, 22. (ἅ ἐστιν πάντα εἰς φθορὰν τῇ [b] ἀποχρήσει), κατὰ τὰ [c] ἐντάλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων;

a Only here and Heb. xi. 28, xii. 20 (quot.) in N.T.

b Only here in Bib. Gk. δι8.) in N.T.

c Not class., only here and Matt. xv. 9 = Mark vii. 7 (quot. also with

"being supplied and united". Often the supply is thought to be of nourishment, but perhaps we should interpret more generally of life. **ἁφ. κ. συν.** are thus the media through which life is communicated and the unity of the organism secured.—**αὔξει τὴν αὔξησιν τοῦ Θεοῦ**: "increaseth with the increase of God". Generally **αὔξ. τ. Θ.** is explained to mean the growth which God gives (*cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 6). Against this is the fact that Christ is referred to as the source of growth. We may better take it "a growth such as God requires" (Ol., Haupt).

Ver. 20. The Apostle, recalling them to the time of their conversion, points out how inconsistent with a death to the elemental spirits any submission to ordinances belonging to their sphere would be. The death of the believer with Christ is a death to his old relations, to sin, law, guilt, the world. It is a death which Christ has Himseif undergone (Rom. vi. 10). Here it is specially their death to the angels, who had ruled their old life, and under whose charge the Law and its ceremonies especially stood. They had died with Christ to legalism, how absurd then for ordinances to be imposed upon them.—**εἰ ἀπεθάνετε σὺν Χριστῷ**: "if, as is the case, you died in union with Christ". The aorist points to the definite fact, which took place once for all. It was in union with Christ, for thus they were able to repeat Christ's own experience.—**ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ κόσμου.** The use of **ἀπὸ** with **ἀποθν.** expresses more strongly than the dative (as in Rom. vi. 2) the completeness of the severance, and adds the idea of escape from the dominion of the personal powers. On **στ. τ. κ.** see note on ver. 8.—**ὡς ζῶντες ἐν κόσμῳ.** For the death of the Christian with Christ includes his crucifixion to the world (Gal. vi. 14). The world is ruled by these angels; but Christians belong to the world to come (*cf.* **τ. μελλόντων,** ver. 17), which, as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews tells us, has not been made subject to the angels. Since they were still living in the physical world **κόσ.** has evidently an ethical sense.—**δογματίζεσθε** may be middle, "subject yourselves to ordinances," or passive. Since Paul nowhere says that the readers had accepted the false teaching, the latter is better: "Why are ye prescribed to?" (Mey., Winer, Hofm., Findl., Haupt.) Alford also takes it as a passive, but thinks it implies a keener rebuke than the middle. The middle asserts rather that they had submitted, the passive need only imply, not their submission, but that their resistance might have been more energetic. If there is blame it seems to be slighter. The verb **δογματ.** is chosen with reference to **τοῖς δόγμασιν** in ver. 14.

Ver. 21. The precepts here quoted are those of the false teachers, and are, of course, quoted to be condemned, though their meaning is frequently misunderstood. It is not said what things are thus prohibited, but the context supports the reference to meats and drinks, and is confirmed by **μηδὲ γεύσῃ.** There is no reason whatever to suppose that there is any reference to a prohibition of sexual relations.—**μὴ ἅψῃ μηδὲ γεύσῃ μηδὲ θίγῃς.** "Handle not, nor taste, nor even touch." There is perhaps a gradation in the order from coarser to more refined contact.

Ver. 22. **ἅ ἐστιν πάντα εἰς φθορὰν τῇ ἀποχρήσει.** Augustine and Calvin took **ἅ** as meaning the ordinances referred to in ver. 20, and explained the words as Paul's refutation, "all which ordinances lead in their use to spiritual destruction". But **ἀποχ.** means much more than use, it means abuse or using up; and **ἅ** refers more naturally to the prohibited things than to the prohibitions; while the sense would be complete if **τῇ ἀποχ.** were omitted. A much more attractive interpretation is that of De Wette (followed by Grimm, Ol. and others). He regards the words as a continuation of the injunctions of the false teachers, "all which things tend to spiritual destruction in the abuse". The sense will then be that certain meats and drinks are forbidden, because the abuse of them leads to spiritual destruction. Lightfoot says "this interpretation, however, has nothing to recommend it". This is perhaps too strong, for on the usual view **κατὰ . . . ἀνθρώπων** comes in awkwardly, as its place is at the end of the prohibitions. But it must be rejected. The translation is a little strained, and it would have been much simpler to say "the use of these things is destructive". It is there-

23. ἅτινά ἐστιν λόγον μὲν ἔχοντα σοφίας ἐν [d] ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ καὶ[1] [b] ἀφειδίᾳ σώματος οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ τινί, πρὸς [e] πλησμονὴν τῆς σαρκός.

d Only here in class. or Bib. Gk.
e Only here in N.T.

[1] So [Ln.], T., Tr. [W.H.], R.V., Ws. with all Greek MSS. except B. **καὶ**: omitted by B, m, Or. (Lat.), Hil.

fore best to adhere to the common view, and translate "all which things are to perish with the using". The meaning is, then, that with consumption the forbidden meats and drinks were destined to perish. This interpretation has the advantage of being forcible, for it throws one side of Paul's refutation into a terse parenthesis. His argument is, these meats and drinks, on which the false teachers lay such stress, are of no such importance, for in the nature of things they perish in their very use. If we can annihilate them they cannot rule us. The words should be included in brackets.—**κατὰ τὰ ἐντάλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων**: to be taken with **δογματίζεσθε**. This states the other side of Paul's refutation. The precepts are not only concerned with things destined to perish, they have their source in human commandments. Lightfoot aptly points out the striking parallel between these words of Paul and those of Christ on defilement (Mark vii.). Both argue from the perishableness of meats, both treat these things as indifferent in themselves, and both quote Isaiah. Even though these precepts are partially found in the O.T., they are rightly called precepts of men, partly because they went beyond what it enjoined, partly because their object is different.

Ver. 23. **ἅτινα**: *i.e.*, which commandments and teachings.—**λόγον σοφίας.** This may be taken in the sense of "a word of wisdom," but with no inner truth. Others translate "appearance of wisdom" (Beng., De W. and others). But this seems not to be a meaning of **λόγ.** Klöpper's translation, "reason" or "ground," yields no very good sense. It is best, with most recent commentators, to translate "a reputation for wisdom". **μέν** is not followed by **δε**, but this is not uncommon (see Winer-Moulton, pp. 719-721).—**ἐν ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ καὶ ἀφειδίᾳ σώματος.** It is impossible to connect **σώμ.** with all three datives (Hofm.), it can belong only to **ἀφειδίᾳ**, with which it is connected as an objective genitive, "severity to the body". If **καὶ** is retained before **ἀφ.** the sense of the earlier datives is not affected. If, however, it is omitted their sense may be affected. It is possible to take **ἀφ.**, then, as an instrumental dative with **λόγον ἔχοντα.** But it is also possible to take it, with Haupt, as an explanatory apposition to the earlier datives. In this case **ἐθελ.** and **ταπ.** have both an ascetic meaning. Against this, however, is the fact that the words cannot be separated from the parallel expressions in ver. 18. This seems to fix the sense of **ἐθελ.** as a worship of angels, which was not required of them, and **ταπ.** will mean what it meant in ver. 18. **ἐθελοθρ.** occurs nowhere else, and was probably coined by Paul. Similar compounds were not unusual, and generally, though not invariably, had a bad sense. This is commonly supposed to attach to this word, but in any case it gets a bad sense from its context. **ἀφ. σώμ.** is the clearest assertion we have of the ascetic character of the false teachings.—**οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ τινί, πρὸς πλησμονὴν τῆς σαρκός.** These words, which constitute this verse one of the most difficult in the New Testament, have received very various explanations. It is disputed whether **οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ τ.** should be connected with the preceding or following words, and also with what **πρ. πλησ. τ. σαρκός** should be connected. Sumner, followed by Conybeare and Evans on 1 Cor. vii. 2, interpreted **πρὸς** as meaning "to check," and translated "not in any value to check the indulgence of the flesh," connecting **οὐκ ἐν τ. τ.** with the following words. This view was adopted by Lightfoot, and has been accepted by Moule and now by Ellicott. It has been inserted, with altogether insufficient warning, in R.V. It is a new explanation, and since propounded has found comparatively little favour. Lightfoot quotes numerous examples to prove that **πρός** after words denoting value, utility, sufficiency, etc., is used in the sense "to check" or "to prevent". But in these cases the meaning does not lie in **πρός**, but in **πρός** after some word which imposes this sense upon it (*e.g.*, **φάρμακον**), and there is nothing of the kind here. Abbott, in his valuable criticism of this interpretation, points out that **πρός** means

III. 1. Εἰ οὖν συνηγέρθητε τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ ἄνω ζητεῖτε, οὗ ὁ Χριστός ἐστιν, ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ καθήμενος· 2. τὰ ἄνω φρονεῖτε μὴ

"with a view to," and if the object is a word signifying action or the production of an effect it will mean with a view to (producing). "Hence it seems to follow that unless **πλησμονή** be taken in the sense of 'a state of repletion,' which would be unsuitable, **πρὸς πλησμονήν** could only mean to produce **πλ.**" A further question relates to the use of **τιμῇ**. Our word "value" is ambiguous, and **τιμή** may mean "value" in the sense of "price". But in this interpretation it is used in the sense of "efficacy," and this sense needs to be established. It seems necessary to reject this explanation on linguistic grounds. But the sense it yields is less good than appears at first sight. For what would be said would be that these things had a reputation for wisdom in "will-worship," etc., but they had not a reputation for wisdom in any value against the indulgence of the flesh. But obviously this cannot be the meaning. The sense imposed "but have not any value" can only be got out of the words by straining them. Another view, which keeps the same connexion of words, is that the translation should be "not in any honour to it [*i.e.*, the body] to satisfy the [reasonable] wants of the flesh". This must be rejected because **πλ.** is not used in this good sense, and **σαρκός** cannot be used as equivalent to **σώματος** in a context where **σώμ.** has been used just before, for the terms must stand in emphatic contrast. Soden and Abbott translate "not in any honour for the full satisfaction of the flesh". This means that there is no real honour, but what there is, is such as to satisfy the carnal nature. So Meyer, not in any honour, but serving to satiate the flesh. The objection to this view is that **ἀλλά** at least is required before **πρὸς πλ. τ. σαρκός.** Alford connects **οὐκ ἐν τ. τ.** with the preceding words, but **πρ. πλ. τ. σ.** with **δογματίζεσθε.** This gives a fairly good sense, and requires no necessary words to be supplied, but the parenthesis is incredibly long. A less lengthy parenthesis is involved in the interpretation of Bähr, Eadie and Weiss: "Which things, having indeed a reputation of wisdom in will-worship and humility and severity to the body, not in any honour, are for the indulgence of the flesh". If the contrast is between severity to the body and honour to it, we should have expected **αὐτοῦ** after **τιμῇ.** It is also strange that **ἐν** should be placed before **τιμῇ** and not before **ἀφειδ.** And the meaning is not probable, for it is implied that Paul thought that a reputation for wisdom ought to rest on honour to the body, which is absurd. Findlay's view, "not in any honour, against surfeiting of the flesh," not only yields a thought most obscurely expressed, but must be rejected because of its translation of **πρὸς.** All these interpretations are open to serious if not fatal objections. It is therefore not unlikely that Hort is right in the suspicion, shared also by Haupt, that we have to do here with a primitive corruption, for which no probable emendation has been suggested. He thinks that the text of the Epistle, and especially of the second chapter, was badly preserved in ancient times.

CHAPTER III.—VV. 1-17. RESURRECTION WITH CHRIST MUST BE COMPLETED BY PARTICIPATION IN HIS HEAVENLY LIFE, WHICH THOUGH AT PRESENT CONCEALED, WILL NOT ALWAYS REMAIN SO. THIS LIFE WITH CHRIST IN HEAVEN DEMANDS THE DEATH OF THE MEMBERS ON THE EARTH, THE HEATHEN VICES OF IMPURITY AND COVETOUSNESS, WHICH BRING DOWN THE WRATH OF GOD. ALL SINS OF MALICE, ANGER AND ABUSE AND ALL LYING MUST BE GIVEN UP, FOR THESE BELONG TO THE OLD NATURE, AND ARE INCOMPATIBLE WITH THE NEW, WITH ITS EVER-GROWING CONFORMITY TO THE DIVINE IMAGE, AND THE CANCELLING OF ALL THOSE DISTINCTIONS WHICH MAKE MEN ALIENS TO EACH OTHER.—With iii. 1 Paul passes to the hortatory portion of the Epistle, the attack on the false teachers ending with ii. 23, and there is no break between vv. 1-4 and ver. 5. The ethical exhortation has its basis in the dogmatic exposition already given, and is therefore connected with it by **οὖν.**—Ver. 1. **εἰ οὖν συνηγέρθητε τῷ Χριστῷ**: "if then [as is the case] you were raised together with Christ". It is not their resurrection when Christ rose of which he speaks, but their personal resurrection with Him at the time of their conversion and baptism. This is the counterpart to death with Him, and as that breaks off the old relations, so this initiates them into the new. They must now work out to its consequences that which they then received in union with Christ. Alford denies that there is any ethical element

τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, 3. ἀπεθάνετε γάρ, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν κέκρυπται σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ Θεῷ· 4. ὅταν ὁ Χριστὸς φανερωθῇ, ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν,[1] τότε καὶ ὑμεῖς σὺν αὐτῷ φανερωθήσεσθε ἐν δόξῃ. 5. [a]νεκρώσατε οὖν τὰ μέλη[2] τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, πορνείαν, ἀκαθαρσίαν, [b]πάθος, ἐπι-

[a] Only here and Rom. iv. 19, Heb. xi. 12 (both of Abr.), in class. or Bib. Gk.

[b] Only here and 1 Thess. iv. 5; Rom. i. 26 in N.T.

[1] So Ln., Tr. mg., W.H., R.V., Ws. with BD^{bc}KL. υμων: T., Tr., W.H. mg., R.V. mg. with ℵCD*FGP, by assimilation to η ζωη υμων (ver. 3).

[2] So T., Tr., W.H., Ws. with ℵ*BC* 17, 71. υμων inserted after μελη by Ln. with ℵ^{c}AC^{3}DEFGHKLP.

in this resurrection, on the ground that if there were there would be no need to exhort to ethical realisation. But this is to misunderstand Paul's idealistic language. Resurrection implies that the death has already taken place, and the death is ethical.—**τὰ ἄνω ζητεῖτε.** The reference is not, as Meyer characteristically makes it, eschatological. It is present fellowship with the exalted Lord, a life in heaven, of which he speaks. The true explanation is suggested by Eph. ii. 6, **συνήγειρεν καὶ συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ** (*cf.* **καθήμενος**). Those who have risen with Christ must realise ascension with Him. —**οὗ ὁ Χριστός ἐστιν, ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ καθήμενος**: "where Christ is, seated on the right hand of God". Two statements are made: Christ is in the region of the things above, and He is seated at the right hand of God. These facts supply the motive for **τ. ἄνω ζ.** Our home with Him is not simply in the region of the things above, but in the highest position there, at God's right hand.

Ver. 2. **τὰ ἄνω φρονεῖτε.** "Set your mind on the things above." **φρ.** is wider in its sense than **ζητ.** It embraces, as Meyer says, "the whole practical bent of thought and disposition".—**μὴ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.** "The things on the earth" are not in themselves sinful, but become so if sought and thought on in preference to the things above (*cf.* Matt. vi. 19-21). There seems to be no reference to the false teachers here.

Ver. 3. **ἀπεθάνετε γάρ**: "for ye died," that is to their old life, at the time of their conversion. It gives the reason for ver. 2. The exhortation is justified because they have died with Christ.—**καὶ ἡ ζωὴ . . . ἐν τῷ Θεῷ.** This risen life (**ζωή** not **βιός**) which they now enjoy through union with Christ is concealed with Him in God. By the fact that it is hidden is not meant that it is secure (Kl.), for the contrast to **κέκ.** is **φαν.** (ver. 4), but that it belongs to the invisible and eternal, to which Christ belongs; perhaps not precisely "shrouded in the depths of inward experiences and the mystery of its union with the life of Christ" (Ell.). **ἐν Θεῷ** asserts Christ's own union with God, and emphasises our union with God in Him. Meyer thinks **ζωὴ** is the "eternal life," now hidden, but to be manifested at the second coming (ver. 4). But this does not suit so well the language of the verse. Our life in God is opposed to life in the world (ii. 20). The transition from the aorist to the perfect is to be noticed.

Ver. 4. This life is not always to remain hidden, it will be manifested at the second coming. And that not merely in union with Christ, for it is Christ Himself who is our Life. This is not to be toned down to mean that Christ is the possessor and giver of eternal life. Paul means quite literally what he says, that Christ is Himself the essence of the Christian life (*cf.* Phil. i. 21, **ἐμοὶ γὰρ τὸ ζῆν Χριστὸς**, also Gal. ii. 20). His manifestation therefore includes that of those who are one with Him. And this can only be a manifestation in glory (*cf.* Rom. viii. 17).

Ver. 5. Partially parallel to Eph. v. 3-5.—**νεκρώσατε οὖν.** "Put to death, therefore" (*cf.* Rom. viii. 13). The aorist implies a single decisive act. Perhaps **νεκ.** is chosen as a weaker word than **θανατόω** (Cremer, Haupt), implying the cessation of functions during life. **οὖν** is interesting. It seems strange that the assertions in the previous verses, of their death and resurrection with Christ and hidden life with Him in God, should be followed by the exhortation to put their members to death. Clearly these assertions are idealistic. The death and resurrection potentially theirs are to be realised in the putting to death of their members, —**τὰ μέλη τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.** The mem-

c Only here and Gal. v. 20; 1 Cor. x. 14; 1 Pet. iv. 3 in class. or Bib. Gk.

θυμίαν κακήν, καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν ἥτις ἐστὶν [c] εἰδωλολατρία, 6. δι' ἃ ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ,[1] 7. ἐν οἷς καὶ ὑμεῖς περιεπατήσατέ ποτε ὅτε ἐζῆτε ἐν τούτοις. 8. νυνὶ δὲ ἀπόθεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα, ὀργήν, θυμόν, κακίαν, βλασφημίαν, αἰσχρολογίαν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος

[1] So T., Tr., W.H., R.V. mg., Ws. with B, Sah., Eth. [Rom.], and probably archetype of D. επι τους υιους της απειθειας: added by all other MSS. and almost all other authorities. Added from Eph. v. 6.

bers are referred to in so far as they are the instruments of the **σάρξ**, and are included in the "things on the earth," with which the Christian has no more concern (ver. 2). Lightfoot places a stop at **γῆς**, and regards **πορνείαν κ.τ.λ.** as governed by **ἀπόθεσθε** (ver. 8). He thinks Paul intended to make these accusatives directly dependent on **ἀπ.**, but, owing to the intervening clauses, changed the form of the sentence. It is true that the apposition of **μέλη** and the list of sins that follows is strange, but not so strange as to make this very forced construction preferable. We should have expected **ἀπ.** at the beginning of the sentence.—**καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν**: "and covetousness," not "impurity". It comes fitly here, for gold provided the means for indulging these lustful passions. For the noun with the article at the end of a series without it, see Winer-Moulton,[9] p. 145. — **ἥτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρία**: "inasmuch as it is idolatry". **ἥτις** refers simply to **πλ.**, not to the whole series of vices enumerated, nor to **μέλη**, by attraction for **ἅτινα.** The lust for wealth sets riches in the place of God (*cf.* Matt. vi. 24).

Ver. 6. Parallel to Eph. v. 6, from which **ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας** has been added in most MSS. The sentence is abrupt without them, and ver. 7 is more easily explained if they are retained (as by Mey., Kl., Ol.), yet their omission in B, combined with their presence in the parallel Eph. v. 6, is too strong to admit of their retention. The verse may refer to a general principle which acts in human life, or the reference may be eschatological. The latter seems to be more in accordance with Paul's usage. **ὀργὴ** is here the outward manifestation of the anger which God even now feels at sin.

Ver. 7. **ἐν οἷς**: in which vices. If **τ. υἱοὺς τ. ἀπ.** be retained, the probable translation is "in whom". Lightfoot thinks in any case the reference to the vices is to be preferred, the chief reason being that Paul could not blame his readers for living among the Gentiles. But, as Meyer points out, **περιεπ.** implies participation in conduct.—**καὶ ὑμεῖς**: you as well as those who still practise these vices. — **περιεπατήσατέ**: a Hebraistic metaphor expressing moral conduct.—**ἐζῆτε ἐν τούτοις**: "ye were living in them," *i.e.*, in these vices. The reference is to their pre-Christian state, in which sin was the atmosphere of their lives. The change of tense should be noticed.

Ver. 8. Vv. 8-10 are largely parallel to Eph. iv. 22-24, 25, 31.—**νυνὶ δὲ**: "but now," emphatic contrast to **ποτε**, now that you have passed from that life of sinful conduct, see that you strip yourselves of these vices.—**ἀπόθεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα**: "do ye also put away all of them".—**κ. ὑμ.**: obviously not you as well as the Ephesians (Holtzm.), but you as well as other Christians. It is not clear whether **τὰ π.** refers exclusively to the preceding sins, to which then **ὀργ. κ.τ.λ.** forms a loose apposition, or whether it includes the latter also. It seems less harsh to give the injunction a forward as well as a backward reference.—**ὀργήν, θυμόν**: usually the former is regarded as the settled anger, of which the latter is the sudden and passionate outburst. Cremer, however, followed by Haupt, regards **θ.** as the inner emotion, of which **ὀρ.** is the external expression. **ὀρ.** is certainly used of the external manifestation of wrath in ver. 6.—**κακίαν**: "malignity," the feeling which prompts a man to injure his neighbour.—**βλασφημίαν**: as the other sins are against men, so this, "slander" not "blasphemy". — **αἰσχρολογίαν.** The word may mean "filthy speech" or "abusive speech". Here the context decides for the latter. Lightfoot, combining both senses, translates "foul-mouthed abuse," but such combinations are generally to be distrusted.—**ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν**: probably this should be connected both with **βλ.** and **αἰσχρ.** Whether it is dependent on **ἀποθ.**, "banish from your mouth" (Mey., Ol., Abb.), is more doubtful, since the interpolation of sins which are not sins of speech makes such a connexion awkward. Prob-

ὑμῶν. 9. μὴ ψεύδεσθε εἰς ἀλλήλους, [d] ἀπεκδυσάμενοι [e] τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ, 10. καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον τὸν [f] ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν, 11. ὅπου οὐκ ἔνι Ἕλλην καὶ Ἰουδαῖος, περιτομὴ καὶ [g] ἀκροβυστία, βάρβαρος, [h] Σκύθης, δοῦλος, ἐλεύθερος, ἀλλὰ τὰ [1] πάντα καὶ ἐν

d ii. 15.
e Rom. vi. 6; Eph. iv. 22.
f Only here and 2 Cor. iv. 16 in class. or Bib. Gk.
g ii. 13.
h Only here in N.T.

[1] So Ln., T., Tr., Lft., R.V., Ws. with ℵcBDEFGKLP. τα: omitted by W.H. with ℵ*AC.

ably, then, the meaning is "proceeding out of your mouth". ὑμ. is emphatic, and recalls the readers to their Christian profession.

Ver. 9. μὴ ψεύδεσθε εἰς ἀλλήλους: "lie not to one another". The imperative changes its tense from aorist to present, the exhortation to the decisive act being followed by a rule for their daily life. εἰς expresses the direction of the utterance. It should not be translated "against" (Kl., Fr.).—ἀπεκδυσάμενοι . . . ἐνδυσάμενοι. These participles may be translated as part of the exhortation, "lie not one to another putting off . . . and putting on," in other words, "put off . . . and put on . . . and lie not". Or they may give a reason for the exhortation, "lie not, seeing ye have put off . . . and put on". In favour of the former is the addition σὺν τ. πρ. αὐτ., for if the practices had been put off at conversion the warning might seem superfluous. ἀνακαιν. (pres.) also points to a continuous process. Either view harmonises with Paul's theology, for he speaks of death to the old and life to the new either as ideally complete in the moment of conversion or as realised gradually in actual experience. But the latter, which is taken by most commentators, is preferable; for the reference is much wider than in the foregoing words. They refer only to the discarding of vices. Paul now emphasises the positive side also, the putting on the new as well as casting off the old.—τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον: *i.e.*, the old non-Christian self (*cf.* Rom. vi. 6, Eph. iv. 22).—πράξεσιν: "practices," such as those already enumerated.

Ver. 10. τὸν νέον. In Eph. iv. 24 we have καινός, "fresh" (as opposed to "worn out"); νέος is new as opposed to old. The idea contained in κ. is here expressed by ἀνακ. Some (including Sod.) regard "the new man" as Christ, according to which "the old man" will be Adam. But this is negatived by the next verse, for if the new man is Christ, Χριστός would be a strange tautology. κτίσ. is also against it, though we have μορφωθῇ Χ., Gal. iv. 19. It is the regenerate self, regenerate, of course, because united with Christ.—ἀνακαινούμενον: "being renewed," the present expressing the continuous process of renewal (*cf.* 2 Cor. iv. 16). There is no reference to a restoration to a former state.—εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν: not to be connected (as by Mey. and Hofm.) with κατ' εἰκόνα, which would give a strange and obscure thought, but to be taken as the object of the renewal. The knowledge is ethical rather than theoretical in this connexion.—κατ' εἰκόνα: to be taken with ἀνακαιν. There is a clear allusion to Gen. i. 26-28, the new self grows to be more and more the image of God. There may perhaps be a side reference to "ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil" in εἰς ἐπίγ.—τοῦ κτίσαντος: *i.e.*, God, not (as Chrys. and others) Christ. Some take κατ' εἰκ. τ. κτ. α. to mean "according to Christ". It is true that Christ is the image of God, but the parallel κατὰ Θεὸν, in Eph. iv. 24, makes this improbable, and we should have expected the article before εἰκ.

Ver. 11. *Cf.* Gal. iii. 28. He has been speaking of sins inconsistent with brotherly love, anger and falsehood. Such sins are incompatible with Christianity, which has abolished even those deep distinctions that divided mankind into hostile camps. In the splendid sweep of the great principle, which has cancelled the most radical differences of nationality, ceremonial status, culture and social position, all minor causes of strife are necessarily included. The solvent of national, racial and even religious hate cannot be powerless before the petty strifes of a Christian church. — ὅπου οὐκ ἔνι: "where there cannot be". ὅπ. seems to refer to "the new man," not to "knowledge" or "the image". In the new man created by God all these dis-

πᾶσιν Χριστός. 12. ἐνδύσασθε οὖν ὡς ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἅγιοι καὶ ἠγαπημένοι, σπλάγχνα οἰκτιρμοῦ, χρηστότητα, ταπεινοφροσύνην, πραΰτητα, μακροθυμίαν, 13. ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων καὶ χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς, ἐάν τις πρός τινα ἔχῃ [1]μομφήν· καθὼς καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἐχαρίσατο ὑμῖν οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς· 14. ἐπὶ πᾶσι δὲ τούτοις τὴν ἀγά-

[1] i Only here in Bib. Gk.

[1] So Ln., Tr., W.H., R.V., Ws. with ABD*FG. **Χριστος**: T., W.H. mg., R.V. mg. with ℵ[ac]CD[bc]EKLP. **Θεος**: ℵ*.

tinctions vanish. **ἔνι** seems not to be for **ἔνεστι**, as used to be said, but, as Buttmann maintained, a form of **ἐν**. Winer-Schmiedel says "**ἔνι** is the older form of **ἐν**, and has the significance of **ἔνεστιν**".—**Ἕλλην κ.τ.λ.** The first two pairs contain opposites, in race and then in religion. For the third pair Paul cannot employ an antithesis, since **Ἕλλ.**, the contrast to **βάρ.**, has already been used in the sense of Gentile. He therefore adds to barbarian the Scythian as the extreme example—Scythae barbaris barbariores (Beng.)—but reverts to the method of opposition in the last pair. The order **Ἕλλ. κ. Ἰουδ.** is unusual, and perhaps due to the fact that he is writing to Gentiles, but in Gal. iii. 28 he is writing to Gentiles too. The usual order is resumed in **περ. κ. ἀκρ.** In **δοῦλ. ἐλεύθ.** he may have a reference to Philemon and Onesimus, but the terms occur also in the Galatian list.—**πάντα καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν Χριστός.** This expresses the thought that Christ is all, and that He is in all the relations of life; **πᾶσιν** is neuter, and **X.** is placed at the end for emphasis. Since He is all, and all things are one in Him, He is the principle of unity, through whom all the distinctions that mar the oneness of mankind are done away.

Ver. 12. This verse and ver. 13 are parallel to Eph. iv. 2, 32. The ethical consequences of having put on the new man are now drawn out in detail.—**ἐνδύσασθε οὖν**: not since Christ has become all and in all to you (Lightf.), but since you have put on the new man.—**ὡς ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ**: *i.e.*, as conformity to your position as God's elect demands. The election is God's choice of them in Christ before creation (Eph. i. 4).—**ἅγιοι καὶ ἠγαπημένοι** qualify **ἐκλ.**, and are not vocatives. **ἠγ.** means, as elsewhere in N.T., beloved of God; he is speaking of their position as Christians.—**σπλάγχνα οἰκτιρμοῦ**: "a heart of compassion," the **σπλ.** being regarded as the seat of emotion.—**χρηστότητα**: almost "sweetness of disposition". It is opposed to "severity" (of God) in Rom. xi. 22.—**ταπεινοφροσύνην, πραΰτητα**: both virtues towards fellow-men, and quite different from **ταπ.** in ii. 18. Neither has reference to man's relation to God. Each is a specifically Christian virtue.

Ver. 13. **χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς**: "forgiving yourselves," but while the variation from **ἀλλήλ.** is probably intentional, the practical difference is very slight. The thought that Christians are members one of another may underlie the choice of expression (*cf.* 1 Pet. iv. 8). It may be chosen to correspond to **ὑμῖν.**—**μομφήν** may have reference to the case of Philemon and Onesimus.—**ὁ Κύριος**: whether this or **ὁ Χριστὸς** be read the reference is to Christ. In the parallel Eph. iv. 32 we have "God in Christ," which is Paul's usual way of putting it. But that is no reason for referring **Κύρ.** to God, for Jesus when on earth forgave sins. The forgiveness they have received is used to enforce the duty of forgiving others. The best illustration is the parable in Matt. xviii. 23-25.

Ver. 14. **ἐπὶ πᾶσι δὲ τούτοις τὴν ἀγάπην**: probably "over all these," carrying on the metaphor of clothing, not "in addition to all". These virtues are manifestations of love, but may be conceivably exhibited where love is absent, so that the mention of it is not superfluous.—**ὅ ἐστιν**: probably "that is," though for criticism of Lightfoot's examples see Abbott. The relative cannot mean **τὸ ἐνδύσασθαι τ. ἀγ.**, for love itself is the **σύνδ.** — **σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος.** Generally **σύνδ.** is explained as that which binds together all the virtues. The genitive is variously interpreted. It has been taken as genitive of the object, but the objection (Luther, Ol., Haupt) that the bond binds the virtues into a unity but does not bind together the unity itself is forcible. It has also been taken as a genitive of quality, "the perfect bond," which Paul would have said if he had meant it. Ellicott regards it as a subjec-

πην, ὅ ἐστιν σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος. 15. καὶ ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ [h] βραβευέτω ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, εἰς ἣν καὶ ἐκλήθητε ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι· καὶ [h] εὐχάριστοι γίνεσθε. 16. ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ [1] ἐνοικείτω ἐν ὑμῖν πλουσίως, ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ διδάσκοντες καὶ νουθετοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς ψαλμοῖς, [k] ὕμνοις, ᾠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς, ἐν τῇ [2]

[k] Only here and Eph. v. 19 (par.) in N.T.

[1] So edd. with ℵcBC²DEFGL. του Θεου: R.V. mg. with AC* 17. του Κυριου: W.H. mg., R.V. mg. with ℵ* cop.

[2] So L., T., Tr., Lft., W.H. mg., Ws. with ℵcBD*E*FG 67**. τη: omitted by W.H. with ℵAKL.

tive genitive, the bond possessed by perfectness; but this seems unlikely. Again, it is explained as the bond which produces perfection in these virtues (Ol.), or as the bond which binds these virtues together and so produces Christian perfection (Sod). If, however, we do not take **τελ.** as an objective genitive, there is no ground for assuming that the bond is that which binds the virtues together. The function of love as a bond is to bind Christians together, and Haupt explains the word in this way. The genitive he regards as one of apposition, the bond in which perfection consists. When love binds all Christians together, the ideal of Christian perfection is attained. This gives a natural and appropriate sense, and is probably right. The view that **σύνδ.** is the sum total gives a sense to the word which it does not bear; nor does it suit the context.

Ver. 15. **ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ**: "the peace which Christ gives". It might be the peace between the members of the Church bestowed by Christ (Calv., Ol., Sod.). This suits the preceding, but not the following words so well, especially, perhaps, **εὐχ. γίν.**—**βραβευέτω**: "rule" (*cf.* ii. 18). The word has lost its old sense "to act as umpire," and there is no reference to a contest or a prize. The meaning is: in deciding on any course of action, let that be chosen which does not ruffle the peace within you.—**εἰς ἣν καὶ ἐκλήθητε**: *i.e.*, to the enjoyment of which ye were called.—**ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι**: "so that ye are in one body," result rather than aim being expressed. Disunion in the body is incompatible with the peace of individual members.—**καὶ εὐχάριστοι γίνεσθε**: "and become thankful," *i.e.*, to God for calling you, or more probably for the peace in your hearts, which is the main thought. **εὐχ.** might mean "gracious" (a rare sense), but this would not be weighty enough to end these exhortations.

Vv. 16, 17. Partially parallel to Eph. v. 19, 20.—Ver. 16. **ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ**: probably, as usually explained, "the Gospel," so called because He proclaimed it and speaks it through His messengers. Lightfoot interprets it as "the presence of Christ in the heart as an inward monitor". The phrase occurs only here, but *cf.* 1 Thess. i. 8, 2 Thess. iii. 1.—**ἐν ὑμῖν**: according to Pauline usage must mean within you, and probably not collectively (Mey., Alf., Abb.) "in you as a Church," but individually.—**ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ**: to be taken with the following words (Beng., Mey., Alf., Ell., Ol., Haupt, Abb.), since **ἐνοικ.** is sufficiently qualified by **πλουσίως**, and **σοφ.** suits **διδάσκ.** much better than **ἐνοικ.** The balance is better preserved, as **ἐν π. σ.** is then parallel to **ἐν χάρ.** Lightfoot meets the last point by taking **ἐν χάρ.** with **διδάσκ.**, but even if this were probable the other arguments are decisive for the connexion with the following words.—**διδάσκοντες καὶ νουθετοῦντες**: *cf.* i. 28. Lightfoot regards the participles as used for imperatives, which Ellicott thinks impossible. There is a slight, but quite intelligible, anacoluthon here.—**ἑαυτοὺς**, as in ver. 13.—**ψαλμοῖς, ὕμνοις, ᾠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς**: to be connected with **διδ. κ. νουθ.**, not with **ᾄδοντες** (Hofm., Kl., Weiss), with which the accusative should have been used. The precise distinctions intended are not certain, and perhaps they should not be sharply drawn. The meaning is, whatever kind of song it may be, let it be made the vehicle of religious instruction and admonition. **ψαλ.** may be restricted to the Old Testament Psalms, but this is improbable. **ὕμν.** are songs of praise to God. **ᾠδ.** has a wider sense, and was used of any class of song. Hence **πν.** is added to it, and not to the others, for **ψαλ.** is used exclusively and **ὕμν.** usually in a religious sense. The word of Christ is to dwell in them so richly that it finds spontaneous expression in religious song

l Only here and Eph. v. 4; Philm. 8 in N.T.
m Only in Paul, exc. Rev. xiv. 13.
n Only here and Rev. viii. 11, x. 9, 10 in N.T.
o Only here and 2 Cor. ix. 2 in N.T.

χάριτι ᾄδοντες ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν τῷ Θεῷ· 17. καὶ πᾶν ὅτι ἐὰν ποιῆτε ἐν λόγῳ ἢ ἐν ἔργῳ, πάντα ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, εὐχαριστοῦντες τῷ Θεῷ πατρὶ δι' αὐτοῦ.

18. Αἱ γυναῖκες, ὑποτάσσεσθε τοῖς ἀνδράσιν, ὡς [l] ἀνῆκεν [m] ἐν Κυρίῳ. 19. οἱ ἄνδρες, ἀγαπᾶτε τὰς γυναῖκας καὶ μὴ [n] πικραίνεσθε πρὸς αὐτάς. 20. τὰ τέκνα, ὑπακούετε τοῖς γονεῦσιν κατὰ πάντα, τοῦτο γὰρ εὐάρεστόν ἐστιν ἐν Κυρίῳ. 21. οἱ πατέρες, μὴ [o] ἐρεθίζετε

in the Christian assemblies or the home. —**ἐν τῇ χάριτι.** Not with sweetness or acceptableness (iv. 6), which does not suit **τ. Θεῷ** or the emphatic position. It may be "by the help of Divine grace," but more probably the meaning is "with thankfulness" (De W., Sod., Haupt, Abb.), on account of the reference to thankfulness in vv. 15 and 17. Thankfulness finds expression in song.—**ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις.** The reference is to the inner song of praise, which is to be the counterpart of the audible singing. What is meant is probably not singing from the heart, though *cf.* Matt. xxii. 37.

Ver. 17. **πᾶν...ἐργῷ**: a nominative absolute.—**πάντα** is governed by **ποιεῖτε** (not **ποιοῦντες**, as Sod.), supplied from **ποιῆτε**. —**εὐχαριστοῦντες.** This is not something additional to actions done in the name of Christ; but these actions are themselves expressions of thankfulness.

Ver. 18-iv. 1. ENFORCEMENT OF THE RECIPROCAL DUTIES OF WIVES AND HUSBANDS, CHILDREN AND PARENTS, SLAVES AND MASTERS, WITH FREQUENT REFERENCE TO THESE DUTIES AS INVOLVED IN THEIR DUTY TO CHRIST.—In this section the reference to the subject precedes that to the ruling parties, and the duty of obedience is emphasised to prevent false inferences from the doctrine that natural distinctions are done away in Christ. Holtzmann, Oltramare and Weiss think these precepts are added in protest against the false teachers' asceticism. The fact that we have similar, and fuller, injunctions in *Ephesians* tells against this. Eph. v. 22 *sq.* and 1 Pet. iii. 6 may be compared.—Ver. 18. **ἀνῆκεν** has been taken as a perfect in sense of present (Luther, Bleek, Ol.), a view said by Winer to be "as unnecessary as it is grammatically inadmissible" (Winer-Moulton,[9] p. 338). Usually it is taken as an imperfect, "as was fitting," and is thought (but this is very dubious) to imply a reproach. Probably **ἐν Κυρ.** is to be joined to it, not to **ὑποτ.** (*cf.* ver. 20).

Ver. 19. **μὴ πικραίνεσθε**: *i.e.*, do not be harsh or irritable. Bengel defines **πικρία** as "odium amori mixtum," which is acute, but "odium" is too strong.

Ver. 20. **κατὰ πάντα** is omitted in Eph. vi. 1.

Ver. 21. **ἐρεθίζετε**: *i.e.*, irritate by exacting commands and perpetual fault-finding and interference for interference' sake. The consequence of such foolish exercise of authority is that the child becomes discouraged; in other words, his spirit is broken, and since what he does leads to constant blame, he loses hope of ever being able to please. "Fractus animus pestis juventutis" (Beng.).

Ver. 22. The case of slaves is treated at greater length than that of the other family relations, probably on account of Onesimus. But Paul was much possessed with the need for keeping Christianity free from the suspicion it naturally created of undermining the constitution of society. So while **δοῦλος, ἐλεύθερος** is a distinction which has vanished for Christianity, in the interests of Christianity as a spiritual power social freedom had to be cheerfully foregone till the new religion was able to assert its principle with success. An instructive parallel is the exhortation to submission to constituted authority in Rom. xiii. In Paul's time slaves probably made up the larger part of the population of the empire.—**τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις**: opposed to their spiritual Lord.—**ὀφθαλμοδουλείαις**: acts of eye-service (singular in Eph. vi. 6), *i.e.*, service which is most zealous when the eye of the master or overseer is upon them. The word was perhaps coined by Paul.—**ὡς ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι.** It is the Christian's first duty to please the Lord, and this he can do only by conscientious performance of his tasks quite apart from the recognition he receives from men. If the principle of his conduct is the pleasing of men, he will neglect his duty where this motive cannot operate.—**ἁπλότητι καρδίας**: "singleness of heart," opposed to the

τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν, ἵνα μὴ [h] ἀθυμῶσιν. 22. οἱ δοῦλοι, ὑπακούετε κατὰ [p] πάντα τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις, μὴ ἐν [p] ὀφθαλμοδουλείαις,[1] ὡς [q] ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι, ἀλλ' ἐν [r] ἁπλότητι καρδίας, φοβούμενοι τὸν Κύριον. 23. ὃ ἐὰν ποιῆτε, ἐκ ψυχῆς ἐργάζεσθε, ὡς τῷ Κυρίῳ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώ- [q] ποις, 24. εἰδότες ὅτι ἀπὸ Κυρίου ἀπολήμψεσθε τὴν [h] ἀνταπόδοσιν τῆς κληρονομίας· τῷ Κυρίῳ Χριστῷ δουλεύετε· 25. ὁ γὰρ ἀδικῶν

p Only here and Eph. vi. 6 (par.) in class. or Bib. Gk.

q Not class. only here, Eph. vi. 6 (par.); Ps. lii. 5 in Bib. Gk.

r Only Paul in N.T.

[1] So T., Tr., W.H., Ws. with ℵCKL. **οφθαλμοδουλεια**: Ln., Lft. with ABDEFG, by assimilation to Eph. vi. 5.

double-dealing of eye-service. — **τὸν Κύριον**: in significant contrast to the masters according to the flesh.

Ver. 23. Not only must the slave's work be done in the fear of the Lord, but done as if it were actually for the Lord that he was doing it, and not for a mere human master. And this principle is to govern every detail of his varied service. — **ἐκ ψυχῆς**: heartily and with good will.—**οὐκ ἀνθρώποις**: their service, Paul would say, is not to be rendered at all (**οὐκ** not **μὴ**) to their earthly master, but exclusively to Christ.

Ver. 24. However their earthly master may reward their service, there is a Master who will give them a just recompense; although they cannot receive an earthly, He will give them a heavenly inheritance.—**ἀπὸ Κυρίου**: in Eph. vi. 8 **παρὰ K.** The absence of the article is noteworthy. It emphasises the position rather than identifies the Person of Him who gives the reward (*cf.* the anarthrous **ἐν υἱῷ**, Heb. i. 1). Haupt thinks that there is no significance to be attached to its omission; but, as Lightfoot says, "it is studiously inserted in the context".— **ἀνταπόδοσιν τῆς κληρονομίας**: the "just recompense consisting in the inheritance". **κλ.** is a genitive of apposition.—**δουλεύετε.** This may be taken as an indicative (Lightf., Findl., Moule, Haupt) or as an imperative (Mey., Ell., Alf., Abb.). The indicative is defended on the ground that it is needed to explain who is meant by **ἀπὸ Κυρίου** (but this was surely obvious), and that the imperative seems to require **ὡς τῷ K.** But Lightfoot himself quotes Rom. xii. 11, where **ὡς** is absent. On the other hand the indicative gives a somewhat flat sense, and the imperative seems to yield a better connexion with ver. 25. It is best then to take it as an imperative.

Ver. 25. This verse provides the reason (**γὰρ**) for **δουλεύετε.** It is disputed whether **ὁ ἀδ.** means the master who treats his slave unjustly, or the slave who by his idleness wrongs his master. To include both (Lightf., Findl., Ol.) is highly questionable, not only because a double reference is on principle to be avoided in exegesis, but because the connexion with **δουλ.** implies that one side of the relation only is being dealt with. It is commonly thought that the verse is an encouragement to the slave, based on the assurance that the master who ill treats him will receive his recompense in due course. In favour of this **οὐκ ἔστιν προσωπ.** is urged, since it implies that they are in a social position which might influence earthly courts, but cannot mitigate the judgment of God. But while a Christian writer could dissuade from vengeance by the thought that vengeance belonged to God alone, it is not credible that Paul should console the slave or encourage him in his duty by the thought that for every wrong he received his master would have to suffer. And, as Haupt says, we should have expected **ὑμᾶς** after **ἀδικῶν** and **δὲ** instead of **γὰρ.** There is also a presumption in favour of an exhortation to the slave here. If it referred to the masters it would have come more naturally after iv. 1. Nor does **προσωπ.** necessarily imply that the wrongdoer is socially more highly placed. It equally well applies to favouritism that might be expected from God on the ground of religious position. So we should interpret the verse (with Weiss and Haupt) as a warning to the Christian slave not to presume on his Christianity, so as to think that God will overlook his misdeeds or idleness.

Chapter IV.—Ver. 1. **ἰσότητα.** The literal meaning is "equality," and Meyer takes it so here (so Ol., Haupt), explaining not of equality conferred by emancipation, but of the treatment of the slave by his master as a brother in Christ. It may,

κομίσεται ὃ ἠδίκησεν, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν [s] προσωπολημψία. IV. 1. Οἱ κύριοι, τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τὴν [a] ἰσότητα τοῖς δούλοις παρέχεσθε, εἰδότες ὅτι καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔχετε Κύριον ἐν οὐρανῷ.

2. Τῇ προσευχῇ προσκαρτερεῖτε, γρηγοροῦντες ἐν αὐτῇ ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ, 3. προσευχόμενοι ἅμα καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν, ἵνα ὁ Θεὸς ἀνοίξῃ ἡμῖν θύραν τοῦ λόγου, λαλῆσαι τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ,[1] δι' ὃ καὶ δέδεμαι, 4. ἵνα φανερώσω αὐτὸ ὡς δεῖ με λαλῆσαι. 5. ἐν σοφίᾳ

[s] Only here and Rom. ii. 11; Eph. vi. 9; Jas. ii. 1 in class. or Bib. Gk.

[a] Only here and 2 Cor. viii. 13, 14 in N.T.

[1] So Ln., T., Tr., W.H., R.V. with most authorities, possibly by assimilation to Eph. iii. 4. **του Θεου**: Ws. with BL 4, 41, 238, Eth., probably under influence of ii. 2.

in spite of Oltramare's denial, mean "equity," and the combination with **δίκ.** suggests this meaning here. The master should regulate his treatment of his slave not by caprice, but by equity.—**παρέχεσθε**: "supply on your part," a dynamic middle.

Vv. 2-6. EXHORTATIONS TO PRAYER, ESPECIALLY FOR THE FURTHERANCE OF THE APOSTLE'S WORK, TO WISDOM TOWARDS THOSE WITHOUT AND TO FITNESS OF SPEECH. — Vv. 2-4 partially parallel to Eph. vi. 18-20. — Ver. 2. **προσκαρτερεῖτε**: *cf.* Rom. xii. 12, Acts i. 14. Steadfastness in prayer is opposed to "fainting" in it, the best illustration being the importunate widow and the importunate friend.—**γρηγοροῦντες** may mean that they are to watch against growing weary so that the prayer becomes mechanical, or, as Soden takes it, against confused thought. But perhaps it is not so much alertness in prayer that is meant as the watchfulness which manifests itself in the form of prayer (so Hofm., Haupt). In favour of this is the use of **γρηγ.** in the religious sense for watchfulness against temptation.—**ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ**: thanksgiving is added, because it springs from the heart thankful for God's gifts, and therefore watchful against losing them.

Ver. 3. **ἡμῶν**: perhaps including all his fellow-workers, probably not Paul alone, on account of the singular (**δέδεμαι**).—**θύραν τοῦ λόγου**: *i.e.*, a removal of whatever obstructs its progress, possibly liberation from prison, to which he was looking forward (Philm. 22). For the metaphor, *cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 9, 2 Cor. ii. 12.—**λαλῆσαι**: "so as to speak," infinitive of the consequence.—**τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ**: the mystery which has Christ for its content. On account of his proclamation of it, and especially of the truth that the Gentiles were admitted freely to its blessings, he is now a prisoner.

Ver. 4. **ἵνα** is variously connected. The usual way is best which connects it with **ἀνοίξῃ**. This is better than going back to **προσευχ.**, while the connexion with **λαλ.** is strained. It may be taken (as Beng., Hofm., Sod.) with **δέδεμαι**, "bound in order that I may manifest," but if so why should Paul have desired liberty? Soden gives a peculiar turn to the thought. He thinks Paul is bound in order that he may manifest to his judges how he can do no other (**δεῖ** emphatic) than preach. This seems to be met by Haupt's criticism that for this we must have had **φανερώσω ὅτι δεῖ με λαλῆσαι αὐτό**.—**φανερώσω**. Soden urges in favour of his interpretation that **φαν.** is never used of Paul's preaching, but there seems to be no reason why it should not be. It is a stronger word than **λαλ.**, he wants to "make it clear".—**ὡς δεῖ με λαλῆσαι** refers to the mode of preaching, but the precise sense is uncertain. Some think it means boldly, others in a way suited to the peculiar circumstances, others in a way that shall be equal to the greatness of the message. Or, again, a reference is assumed by many to the Judaising opposition. But probably the feeling that prompts the words is that in prison his activity was curbed, and he wished to be free that he might preach the Gospel without restriction.

Ver. 5. *Cf.* Eph. v. 15. An exhortation to wise conduct in relation to non-Christians.—**τοὺς ἔξω**: those outside the Church; the reference is suggested by the mention of **θύραν τ. λόγου**. They must be wise in their relations with them so as not to give them an unfavourable impression of the Gospel.—**τὸν καιρὸν ἐξαγοραζόμενοι**: "making your market fully from the occasion" (Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 149). They are to seize the fitting opportunity when it occurs to do good to "those without," and thus promote the spread of the Gospel.

περιπατεῖτε πρὸς τοὺς ἔξω, τὸν καιρὸν [b] ἐξαγοραζόμενοι. 6. ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν πάντοτε ἐν χάριτι, ἅλατι [c] ἠρτυμένος, εἰδέναι πῶς δεῖ ὑμᾶς ἑνὶ ἑκάστῳ ἀποκρίνεσθαι.

7. Τὰ κατ' ἐμὲ πάντα γνωρίσει ὑμῖν Τυχικός, ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἀδελφὸς καὶ πιστὸς διάκονος καὶ σύνδουλος ἐν Κυρίῳ, 8. ὃν ἔπεμψα πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἵνα γνῶτε [1] τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν [1] καὶ παρακαλέσῃ τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, 9. σὺν Ὀνησίμῳ τῷ πιστῷ καὶ ἀγαπητῷ ἀδελφῷ, ὅς ἐστιν ἐξ ὑμῶν· πάντα ὑμῖν γνωρίσουσιν τὰ [d] ὧδε.

10. Ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς Ἀρίσταρχος ὁ [e] συναιχμάλωτός μου, καὶ Μᾶρκος ὁ [f] ἀνεψιὸς Βαρνάβα, περὶ οὗ ἐλάβετε ἐντολάς, (ἐὰν ἔλθῃ

[b] Only here and Eph. v. 16 (par.); Gal. iii. 13, iv. 5 in N.T.
[c] Only here and Mark ix. 50; Luke xiv. 34 in N.T.
[d] Only here and 1 Cor. iv. 2 in Paul.
[e] Only here and Rom. xvi. 7; Philm. 23 in class. or Bib. Gk.
[f] Only here in N.T.

[1] So edd. with ABD*GP. γνω. . . . υμων: ℵcCDbcEKL; γνωτε . . . υμων: ℵ*, but corrected to γνωτε . . . ημων by ℵc, who re-corrected into γνω. . . . υμων.

Ver. 6. **ἐν χάριτι**: probably "gracious," "pleasant" is the meaning; by the sweetness and courtesy of their conversation they are to impress favourably the heathen. Some (most recently Haupt) think Divine grace is meant, but this does not suit **ἅλατι** so well.—**ἅλατι ἠρτυμένος.** In classical writers "salt" expressed the wit with which conversation was flavoured. Here wisdom is probably meant on account of **εἰδέναι.** There may be the secondary meaning of wholesome, derived from the function of salt to preserve from corruption.—**εἰδέναι**: "so as to know".—**πῶς κ.τ.λ.**: they must strive to cultivate the gift of pleasant and wise conversation, so that they may be able to speak appropriately to each individual (with his peculiar needs) with whom they come in contact.

Vv. 7-18. COMMENDATION OF THE BEARERS OF THE LETTER, WITH SALUTATIONS FROM HIS FELLOW-WORKERS AND HIMSELF.—Vv. 7, 8 parallel to Eph. vi. 21, 22.—Ver. 7. **Τυχικός** is mentioned in Acts xx. 4, Eph. vi. 21, Tit. iii. 12, 2 Tim. iv. 12. He belonged to the province of Asia, and was sent at this time not only with this letter but with the Epistle to the Ephesians.—**ἀδελφὸς** is usually taken to express his relation to the members of the Church, though Haupt thinks it means Paul's brother.—**πιστὸς διάκονος**: "faithful minister," probably to Paul, not to Christ. **πισ.** goes also with **σύνδουλος,** and since this expresses a relation to Paul it is probable that **διάκ.** does so too.—**ἐν Κυρίῳ**: to be taken with all three nouns on account of the single article.

Ver. 8. **ἔπεμψα**: "I am sending" (epistolary aorist).—**γνῶτε τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν.** This is not only the better attested reading but yields the better sense, because both before (ver. 7) and after (ver. 9) Paul says that Tychicus will acquaint them with matters at Rome. He wishes to relieve the anxiety of the Colossians as to his welfare.—**παρακαλέσῃ**: see on ii. 2. This function is not ascribed to Onesimus, who was not a **σύνδουλος.**

Ver. 9. **Ὀνησίμῳ.** Philemon's runaway slave, who was rescued by Paul and converted to Christianity. Paul sent him back to his master, with the exquisite Epistle to Philemon despatched at the same time as this letter. He speaks of him in the most affectionate terms, to secure a welcome for him at Colossæ. He seems from this passage to have belonged to Colossæ, and we may infer that this was the home of Philemon. If the author of Colossians learnt his name from the Epistle to Philemon, it is strange that he should have contented himself with this bald reference, and made no allusion to his desertion, conversion and return to his master. Such omission here is characteristic of Paul's delicacy.—**τὰ ὧδε** is wider than **τὰ κατ' ἐμὲ** (ver. 7). It means all that is happening to the Church in Rome.

Ver. 10. **Ἀρίσταρχος**: a native of Thessalonica, mentioned in Acts xix. 29, xx. 4, xxvii. 2, Philm. 24. In Philm. Epaphras is mentioned as Paul's fellow-prisoner. Fritzsche suggested that his friends took turns in voluntarily sharing his captivity, and explained the difference between the two Epistles in this way. The divergence between the two Epistles testifies to authenticity, for an imitator would not have created a difficulty of

πρὸς ὑμᾶς δέξασθε αὐτόν,) 11. καὶ Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰοῦστος, οἱ ὄντες ἐκ περιτομῆς οὗτοι μόνοι συνεργοὶ εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, οἵτινες ἐγενήθησάν μοι [f] παρηγορία. 12. ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς Ἐπαφρᾶς ὁ ἐξ ὑμῶν, δοῦλος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, πάντοτε ἀγωνιζόμενος ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν

[g] Only here and Rev. xvi. 10, 11, xxi. 4 in N.T.

ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς, ἵνα σταθῆτε [1] τέλειοι καὶ πεπληροφορημένοι ἐν παντὶ θελήματι τοῦ Θεοῦ. 13. μαρτυρῶ γὰρ αὐτῷ ὅτι ἔχει πολὺν [g] πόνον ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ τῶν ἐν Λαοδικίᾳ καὶ τῶν ἐν Ἱεραπόλει. 14.

[1] So T., Tr., W.H., Ws. with ℵ*B 23, 71. στητε: Ln., R.V. with ℵcACDGKLP.

this kind. **Μᾶρκος** (so accented by Blass and Haupt, who refers to Dittenberger in confirmation), the cousin (**ἀνεψιὸς**) of Barnabas, who may by this time have been dead. He is no doubt the John Mark of the Acts and the evangelist.—**ἐλάβετε ἐντολάς.** We do not know what these commands were. **ἐλάβ.** cannot be an epistolary aorist (2nd person), therefore the commands must have been sent previously. **ἐὰν ἔλθῃ κ.τ.λ.** may express the substance of them.—**δέξασθε.** Paul may have feared that Mark's defection from him, which led to the sharp quarrel between him and Barnabas, might prejudice the Colossians against him. The mention of his relationship to Barnabas was probably intended as a recommendation to their kindness. He seems to have been unknown to the Colossians.

Ver. 11. **Ἰησοῦς**: otherwise unknown to us. Zahn has well pointed out that the mention of this name, in addition to those mentioned in Philemon, creates difficulties for the impugners of the authenticity. If Philemon was authentic why should an imitator venture to add an unknown person, and especially to give him the name Jesus, that so soon became sacred among Christians? If not authentic, why should he not have copied himself?—**οἱ ὄντες ἐκ περιτομῆς**: to be taken with the following words, in spite of the awkwardness of the construction. What is meant is that these are the only ones of the circumcision who have been a help to him. If a stop is placed at **περ.**, we get the sense that these who have just been mentioned are his only fellow-workers, which is not true. Aristarchus is probably not included, for he went as one of the deputation sent by the Gentile Christians with the collection for the Church at Jerusalem.—**οὗτοι μόνοι**: for the attitude of Jewish Christians in Rome towards Paul *cf.* Phil. i. 15-17, ii. 19-24. This is more natural in a letter from Rome than from Cæsarea.—**βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ.** The phrase is intentionally chosen; the Jews were devoted to the kingdom; Paul should have found in the Jewish Christians his best helpers. —**ἐγενήθησαν**: the aorist seems to point to some special incident.

Ver. 12. **Ἐπαφρᾶς**: see on i. 7. He was either a native of Colossæ or had settled there.—**δοῦλος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ.** Paul uses this term often of himself, but of no one else except here and Phil. i. 1, where he calls himself and Timothy **δοῦλοι Χ. Ἰ.** Meyer and Alford connect with **ὁ ἐξ ὑμ.**, but it is better to place a comma after **ὑμῶν**.—**πεπληροφορημένοι**: see on ii. 2. Usually it is translated here "fully assured". Haupt thinks that after **τέλειοι** this is unsuitable. But if we translate "complete" or "filled," this is tautological, and it is not clear that **τέλ.** covers full assurance.—**ἐν παντὶ θελήματι Θεοῦ**: "in everything that God wills". Meyer and Alford connect with **σταθῆτε** (or as they read **στῆτε**), but it is better to connect with the two participles.

Ver. 13. The anxiety of Epaphras for these Churches was probably due to his connexion with them, either as founder or teacher.

Ver. 14. **Λουκᾶς ὁ ἰατρὸς ὁ ἀγαπητὸς**: "Luke the physician, the beloved," no doubt to be identified with the evangelist Luke. His writings have been shown to exhibit a considerable use of medical terms. The name was originally Lucanus. He was clearly not one "of the circumcision" (ver. 11), and this, as often pointed out, seems to exclude the possibility that he wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews.—**Δημᾶς**: mentioned last and without commendation. This is commonly explained as due to a foreboding of Paul that he would turn out badly, suggested by the reference to him in 2 Tim. iv. 10 as having left him. But in Philm. 24 he is placed before Luke and numbered among Paul's fellow-workers.

ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς Λουκᾶς ὁ ἰατρὸς ὁ ἀγαπητὸς, καὶ Δημᾶς. 15. ἀσπάσασθε τοὺς ἐν Λαοδικίᾳ ἀδελφοὺς καὶ Νύμφαν καὶ τὴν κατ᾽ οἶκον αὐτῆς[1] ἐκκλησίαν. 16. καὶ ὅταν ἀναγνωσθῇ παρ᾽ ὑμῖν ἡ ἐπιστολή, ποιήσατε ἵνα καὶ ἐν τῇ Λαοδικέων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀναγνωσθῇ, καὶ τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικίας ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀναγνῶτε. 17. καὶ εἴπατε Ἀρχίππῳ, Βλέπε τὴν διακονίαν ἣν παρέλαβες ἐν Κυρίῳ, ἵνα αὐτὴν πληροῖς.

18. [h] Ὁ ἀσπασμὸς τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου. μνημονεύετέ μου τῶν δεσμῶν. ἡ χάρις μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν.

h 2 Thess iii. 17; 1 Cor. xvi. 21.

[1] So Ln., Tr. mg., W.H., R.V. mg., Ws. with B 67[2]. **αυτου**: DEFGKL; **αὐτῶν**: T., Tr., Lft., R.V. with ℵACP 17, 47.

Possibly he wrote the Epistle, and is thus mentioned last and without praise.

Ver. 15. **Νυμφαν** may be masculine (**Νυμφᾶν**) or feminine (**Νύμφαν**). The Doric form, **Νύμφαν**, is improbable; on the other hand the contracted form, **Νυμφᾶν**, is rare. If **αὐτῶν** is read, either is possible. Otherwise the decision is made by the choice between **αὐτοῦ** and **αὐτῆς**. It seems probable that **αὐτῶν** was due to change by a scribe who included **ἀδελφ.** in the reference. And a scribe might alter the feminine, assuming that a woman could not have been mentioned in this way. The attestation of **αὐτῆς** is very strong, though numerically slight. The Church in her house was a Laodicean Church, distinct apparently from the chief Church of the town.

Ver. 16. **τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικίας**: clearly a letter sent by Paul to Laodicea, which the Colossians are instructed to procure and read. It may be a lost letter, or it may be our so-called Epistle to the Ephesians, to which Marcion refers as the Epistle to the Laodiceans, and which was probably a circular letter. Weiss argues that it cannot be the Epistle to the Ephesians, for that was sent at the same time as this, and therefore Paul could not have sent salutations to Laodicea in this letter. But this is really natural, if Ephesians was a circular letter (and the absence of salutations is difficult to explain otherwise), and if this letter was to be passed on to Laodicea.

Ver. 17. Archippus may have been at Laodicea, but more probably not, for we should have expected the reference to him in ver. 15. The Church is entrusted with the duty of exhorting one of its ministers. There is no need to infer any slackness on his part.—**ἐν Κυρίῳ** is added to emphasise its importance, and the need that it should be zealously fulfilled.

Ver. 18. **τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ**: the rest of the letter would be written by an amanuensis. As he writes, his chain, fastened on his left hand, would impress itself on his notice. Hence the touching request "Remember my bonds," which may bear the special sense "remember in your prayers".—**ἡ χάρις μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν**: so without any defining addition in Eph. and 1 and 2 Tim. It is not so in the earlier letters, but neither is it so in Phil. (or Titus).

THE ABERDEEN UNIVERSITY PRESS LIMITED.

FOR
REFERENCE
Not to be
taken from
this library

NYACK COLLEGE - MANHATTAN
3 9736 00017 7315